R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 706 SP 001 199

NDEA INSTITUTES FOR TRAINERS OF TEACHERS (SUMMER, 1966).
BY- HOOK, J.N.
ILLINOIS UNIV., URBANA

PUB DATE OCT 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.48 87P.

DESCRIPTORS- ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, COLLEGE TEACHERS, CONSULTANTS, ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, *INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS), *PARTICIPANT SATISFACTION, QUESTIONNAIRES, *TEACHER BACKGROUND, *TEACHER EDUCATION, *TEACHER IMPROVEMENT, URBANA, NDEA

NINE NDEA-SPONSORED INSTITUTES FOR TEACHER TRAINERS OFFERED AT SEVEN UNIVERSITIES IN SUMMER 1966 WERE ASSESSED AS TO MERIT AND POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT. ABOUT TWO-THIRDS OF THE 275 PARTICIPANTS WERE COLLEGE PERSONS WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR PREPARING TEACHERS, AND OVER ONE-HALF OF THE OTHERS HAD ELEMENTARY-LEVEL RESPONSIBILITIES. THE HIGHEST DEGREES HELD BY THE 251 RESPONDENTS WERE MASTER'S (67.8 PERCENT), DOCTORATE (16.3 PERCENT), AND BACCALAUREATE (15.9 PERCENT). THE TYPICAL PARTICIPANT HAD 10-12 YEARS EXPEREINCE, OFTEN ON MORE THAN ONE ACADEMIC LEVEL (LIKE THE TYPICAL STAFF MEMBER). INSTRUMENTS OF EVALUATION INCLUDED QUESTIONNARES (FOR ALL PARTICIPANTS, PARTICIPANTS IN SPECIFIC INSTITUTES, DIRECTORS AND KEY STAFF MEMBERS, AND DIRECTORS) AND STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS. ALL OF THE DIRECTORS AND STAFF MEMBERS FELT THE INSTITUTES SHOULD BE CONTINUED, AND PARTICIPANTS RESPONDED 218 TO 4 IN FAVOR OF THEM. RECOMMENDATIONS WERE--MORE INSTITUTES, AN AVERAGE SIZE OF 30 PARTICIPANTS, CAREFUL BUT NOT RIGID PLANNING, SPACE AND TIME (2-3 HOURS A WEEK) FOR SOCIALIZING, REASONABLY HETEROGENEOUS GROUPS, EARLY AND FULL INVOLVEMENT OF STAFF, A LIGHT TEACHING LOAD FOR THE DIRECTOR, EXTENSIVE USE OF CONSULTANTS, AN ACTIVE ROLE FOR PARTICIPANTS, AND INTERWEAVING AND DEVELOPMENT OF NEW MATERIALS. BROCHURES FROM THE DIRECTOR APPEARED MOST EFFECTIVE IN CALLING AN INSTITUTE TO THE ATTENTION OF POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS. (AF)

1199

ED012706

Copy 2

FINAL REPORT

Contract No. OEC2-6-001005-1005

NDEA INSTITUTES FOR TRAINERS OF TEACHERS (SUMMER, 1966)

October, 1966

SP 001 199

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of Education
[redacted]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NDEA INSTITUTES FOR TRAINERS OF TEACHERS (SUMMER, 1966)

Contract No. OE C2-6-001005-1005

By J. N. Hook

October, 1966

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

University of Illinois

Urbana, Illinois

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

Introduction 1
The Basic Purposes of the Assessment. 3
Procedures in the Assessment. 3
Staff Experience. 7
The Participants. 8
Should Institutes for Trainers of Teachers be Continued?. . 9
Recommendations for Future Institutes 16
    1. Number of participants. 16
    2. Duration of the institute 17
    3. Schedule. 17
    4. Mechanics of operation. 19
    5. Participants' Reactions to Staff. 20
    6. Reactions to Participants 22
    7. Intra-staff Working Arrangements. 24
    8. Content and Procedures 27
    9. Miscellaneous .35
Reactions to Specific Institutes. 39
    1. University of Arizona--Educational Media. 39
    2. Carnegie Institute of Technology--History 43
    3. Columbia University Teachers College--Linguistics for the Hearing Impaired. 47
    4. University of California (Los Angeles)--English as a Foreign Language 50
    5. University of Minnesota--English. 59
    6. University of Minnesota--Foreign Languages. 63
    7. University of Minnesota--Geography. 68
    8. Tulane University--History. 72
    9. University of Wyoming--Reading. 76
Summary 82
Appendix 83

INTRODUCTION

In the summer of 1966, for the first time, Title XI of the National Defense Education Act provided financial support for institutes for trainers of teachers. Nine such institutes were sponsored--two in English, two in history, and one each in geography, educational media, modern foreign languages, reading, and English as a second language.[1]

These nine institutes differed chiefly in the following two ways from previously sponsored institutes and from other 1966 NDEA institutes:

1. The participants were in one way or another engaged in the preparation or supervision of teachers. Most were themselves college teachers; a much smaller number were members of State departments of education, classroom teachers on other than the college level, media specialists, secondary school critic teachers, or supervisors of student teachers.

2. Because the participants were different, the purposes and content of these nine institutes were necessarily different. Whereas "regular" institutes are intended to emphasize recent developments in content and new materials with which elementary and secondary teachers are likely to be relatively unfamiliar, and also usually to pay some attention to methodology, these nine looked at content, materials, and sometimes methodology from mainly a college point of view. Because as a group these participants were relatively sophisticated, it was generally unnecessary to present basic material; academically, then, the nine institutes were on a higher level. Further, the nine stressed teacher preparation, most of them at least occasionally getting into such questions as the organization of college and

---

1. See the appendix for details.

> supervisory programs designed to prepare elementary or secondary teachers most effectively for their future work in the schools.

In 1965 and early 1966 an ad hoc consortium of nonprofit professional membership organizations was organized under the name Consortium for Studies of Special Programs for Improvement of Instruction. The following organizations were included:

Association of American Geographers (AAG)
American Historical Association (AHA)
Department of Audiovisual Instruction, NEA (DAI)
International Reading Association (IRA)
Modern Language Association of America (MLA)

In the spring of 1966 this consortium, with the AAG as the contractor, secured USOE financial support for a number of studies, including assessment or evaluation of NDEA institutes. Under a subcontract, the MLA arranged to conduct seven special studies, including an assessment of the nine institutes for trainers of teachers.

The MLA then put the writer of this report in charge of the assessment, authorizing him to employ consultants and secretarial help, to develop necessary instruments and procedures, to supervise the conduct of the assessment, and to prepare a report in whatever detail he considered advisable. This report is therefore an authorized statement but should not be construed as an official statement of any views of the MLA or other organizations in the Consortium.

THE BASIC PURPOSES OF THE ASSESSMENT

The term "assessment" rather than "evaluation" was purposely chosen to describe the study. The purpose was not to evaluate, i.e., to determine whether any of the nine institutes was "good" or "poor." Instead, the study was intended to discover whether institutes for trainers of teachers are actually needed. Do they serve a worthwhile purpose? Are they worth what they cost? As one interviewer usually phrased the question, "Do such institutes warrant the expenditure of taxpayers' dollars?" Should this kind of institute be continued in the future?

Secondly, if the answers to the first questions are Yes, that such institutes are indeed worth their cost, then how can other institutes for trainers of teachers be made even better in the future? The first summer's institutes were necessarily experimental. No one had directed anything just like them before. The probability, then, was that mistakes would be made that could be avoided in the future, and that strengths would be discovered that could result in positive recommendations for future directors.

In brief, then, the study attempted to answer two questions: Should institutes for trainers of teachers be offered in the future? If so, how can they be made stronger than the pioneer 1966 institutes?

PROCEDURES IN THE ASSESSMENT

It was not until late May, 1966, that the contract and subcontract providing funds for the assessment were approved and signed. For that reason it was necessary to move at a rapid pace in developing a plan and preparing the instruments. Ideally, a geographically representative group of leaders in the seven subjects represented by the institutes should have been brought together for two or three days to establish guidelines and manufacture the tools. But since May or June is a very busy time for college teachers, and since visits to most of the institutes would have to be made in July, the ideal procedure was impossible to follow. The director had to rely more heavily on University of Illinois colleagues than he might have if time had not been a problem. Fortunately, Illinois has on its faculty a number of persons with experience in directing institutes and with strong backgrounds in teacher preparation. It is probable, then, that the study would not have been markedly different in plan if personnel outside the University of Illinois had been involved in the first stage.

At the end of May the director and four colleagues spent a day in preliminary planning. The four were Professor Katherine O. Aston, chariman of the Division of Teaching English as a Second Language; Paul Jacobs, research associate (now associate director) of the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in Preparation of Secondary School Teachers of English, and formerly supervisor of language arts for the State of Florida; Professor John Thompson, Department of Geography, and a former director of institutes; and Professor Robert Waller, Department of History, who in 1965 and 1966 directed institutes in history.

In its discussion this group considered instruments and procedures used in earlier institute assessments or evaluations, specifically in English, history, geography, foreign languages, and reading, and agreed upon variations or adaptations desirable because of the different nature of institutes for trainers of teachers. The group agreed that the following fourteen instruments should be prepared:

1. A basic written questionnaire, which all participants in the nine institutes would be asked to fill out. (This was later prepared by J. N. Hook, with help from consultants.)

2. Nine special supplementary questionnaires, each designed to secure specific information concerning a particular institute; the appropriate one of these would be filled out by each participant. (These were later prepared by the following persons: Professors George Smith and Clemens Hallman, Indiana University, foreign languages; Dean James Brown, San Jose State College, educational media; Professor Aston, teaching English as a second language; Professor Thompson, geography; Professor Waller, history; Mr. Jacobs, reading; Professor Aston and Professor Hook, English for the hearing impaired; and Professor Hook, English.

3. A written questionnaire to be filled out by the nine institute directors and their key staff members. (Prepared by Professor Hook, with consultant help.)

4. A written questionnaire to be filled out by the directors only. (Prepared by Professor Hook, with consultant help.)

5. Structured oral interview questions to be asked of participants at the time of each visit. (Prepared by Professor Hook, with consultant help.)

6. Structured oral interview questions to be asked of directors and key staff members at the time of each visit. (Prepared by Professor Hook, with consultant help.)

By the end of June these instruments, with one minor exception, had been prepared and duplicated. (The exception was completed in July.) Also, Dr. Kenneth Mildenberger of the MLA had informed the directors of the nine institutes concerning the study and had enlisted their cooperation, and the director of the study had corresponded with the institute directors about details of the visits.

The consultants had recommended that in general the next-to-last week would be the best time to visit each institute. Their reasoning was that an earlier visit would be undesirable, because participants would not yet have as broad as possible an overview of the whole institute. A visit during the last week would also be undesirable, since the final week is notoriously an exceptionally busy one. Eight of the visits, therefore, were made during the next-to-last week; the ninth, to an institute only three weeks in length, was made at the beginning of the final week.

The airlines strike and a broken leg of one of the intended visitors necessitated three last-minute substitutions. The visitors were as follows:

University of Arizona, Educational Media--Dr. Edward N. Hook, Mesa, Arizona, Public Schools

Carnegie Institute of Technology, History--Professor Robert Waller, Department of History, University of Illinois

Columbia University Teachers College, English for the Hearing Impaired--Professors Katharine Aston and J. N. Hook, Department of English, University of Illinois

University of California at Lost Angeles, Teaching of English as a Second Language--Professor Kenneth Croft, Professor of English and anthropology, San Francisco State College

University of Minnesota, English--Professor J. N. Hook

University of Minnesota, Foreign Language--Professor J. N. Hook

University of Minnesota, Geography--Professor Robert E. Gabler, Head, Department of Geography, Western Illinois University

Tulane University, History--Professor Waller

University of Wyoming, Reading--Professor John Erickson, Department of Secondary Education, University of Illinois

Without exception, the visitors were received with great cordiality and hospitality, despite the fact that their presence imposed an extra burden on busy people. Typically, visits were for two full institute days; the range was one and one-half to three days. Upon arrival, a visitor studied the questionnaires that had been filled out in advance by the director and key staff; doing so enabled him to make desirable modifications in the interview questions. He then interviewed the director for thirty minutes and key staff members for twenty minutes each. He next interviewed as many of the participants as time permitted. (In total, this amounted to 235 of the possible 275.) At the conclusion of each participant interview, the visitor left the general and the special questionnaires to be filled out and mailed to the director of the study. When possible, visitors also audited one or more class sessions, inspected displays of books and materials, and met socially with participants and staff. Upon completion of each visit, the visitor sent the director of this study the faculty questionnaires he had picked up, along with a brief statement giving frankly his impressions of the institute.

When all the data were in, the director had at his disposal the following information:

1. completed questionnaires from 48 institute directors and key staff members

2. completed supplementary questionnaires from 10 institute directors (including one co-director)

3. completed general questionnaires from 246 participants (of a possible 275)

4. completed questionnaires on particular institutes from 245 participants (of a possible 275)

5. responses to interview questions from 45 directors and key staff members

6. responses to interview questions from 235 participants

7. written impressions from the seven visitors.

The questionnaire responses were then tabulated, and the interview responses were read and interpreted. (N.B. In tables that follow, the totals often are not the same as those given above, because not all respondents answered all questions.)

STAFF EXPERIENCE

Forty-six directors and staff members, of a total of 48 respondents, answered questions concerning themselves. Twenty-one of these held doctorates (3 Ed.D., 18 Ph.D.), 24 held master's degrees (17 M.A., 7 M.[illegible].), and one had only the B.S. degree. Their years of teaching experience averaged 14--a relatively young group, though in most institutes youth was leavened by age.

The range of teaching experience was surprisingly large and varied. Twenty-one had taught in elementary schools, 30 in secondary schools, and 41 ahd previous college teaching experience. Several reported teaching abroad as well as in the United States. Twenty-six reported experience in teaching in or directing earlier institutes.

Undergraduate and graduate majors of the faculty were about as to be expected. Teachers in English institutes had usually majored in English or linguistics, history teachers in history, and so on. Reading institute faculty for the most part held degrees in elementary education; faculty of the institute in English for the hearing impaired had as a rule gone through specialized curriculums for educating the deaf, educational media faculty had varied academic backgrounds.

THE PARTICIPANTS

Original plans for the nine institutes called for a total of 276 participants, with a range of 24 to 50 per institute, and with 30 as the most popular number. One late withdrawal reduced the total to 275, an average of 30.6 participants per institute.

The official announcement of institutes provided the following rather vague breakdown of the kinds of participants expected:

"Trainers of teachers"--30 + 25 + 30 (Total 85)

"Trainers of teachers, 50 college teachers"

"College methods teachers and secondary school critic teachers"--24

"Supervisors of student teachers"--32

"Instructors from teacher preparation centers for the deaf or members of State departments of education who are responsible for language instruction and in-service training"--25

"Teachers and trainers of teachers"--30

"College and university trainers of teachers"--30

Participants were asked to indicate "your rank and title in your teaching position." The replies were sometimes too vague to permit accurate tabulation; for instance in a number of instances a respondent called himself simply an "instructor," and other evidence revealed that these "instructors" might be on either the secondary or college level, though most are probably college teachers. For what it is worth, the tabulation of 225 responses is as follows:

College--110
High School--24
Elementary--34

Instructor--48
Supervisor--3
Chairman--1
Department head--5
Visiting lecturer--1
Director of extension--1
Consultant--2
Coordinator of public schools--4
Education director--1
Special education--1

Apparently about two thirds of the participants were college persons responsible in one way or another for preparation of teachers. Of the remaining one third, somewhat over half had responsibilities primarily on the elementary level.

The participants were also asked to indicate their highest degree held. Of 251 respondents here, 41 (16.3%) held doctorates, most frequently the Ph.D.; 170 (67.8%) held master's degrees; and the remaining 40 (15.9%) had only the baccalaureate.

The respondents were asked about their teaching experience, but the responses did not permit tabulation. An impressionistic review, however, suggests that the typical participant had ten or twelve years of experience, often on more than a single academic level. In experience, then, the typical participant had almost as many years as did the typical staff member.

SHOULD INSTITUTES FOR TRAINERS OF TEACHERS BE CONTINUED?

It will be recalled that the first question to be answered by this study has to do with the worthwhileness of institutes for trainers of teachers. Do such institutes offer results commensurate with the time and cost involved?

One of the last of the 86 written questions asked of directors and staff was this: "In the light of your experience in this institute, would you recommend that the USOE be encouraged to fund more institutes for trainers of teachers in your field?" All 48 of the respondents checked *Yes*.

It also seemed desirable to ask the instructional personnel to estimate the possible size of the "market" for possible future institutes. They were asked: "If your answer to [the question quoted above] is Yes, and taking into consideration the fact that trainers of teachers often are asked to teach in the summer, what is your best guess concerning the number of trainers of teachers in your field who might profitably and willingly avail themselves of an institute in any given summer? (Your guess should be a national figure." Forty-one persons responded, as follows:

	English	English for H.I.	TESL	Ed. Media	History	Geog.	FL	Read.
a. 25-50		2	2		1			
b. 51-75			4		1	1		
c. 76-100	2	3		1				1
d. 101-150	1			1	2		3	
e. 151-200				1		3	1	3
f. (Specify)				2				5
Average:	c.100	c.67	c.54	c.257	c.75	c.47	c.122	c.595

(The exceptionally high figure for Reading is probably due to the fact that the Wyoming Reading Institute participants were supervisors of reading, of whom their are several thousand in the United States. The Wyoming director reported receiving 1500 completed applications.) Clearly the number of responses here is too small to be taken very seriously. Nevertheless, the informed guesses of these well-qualified respondents suggest that there would be enough takers in each of the seven subjects to justify one, two, or in some instances more such institutes in each subject each summer.

Another indication of the potential "market" lies in the number of inquiries received, application forms sent out, and completed applications received. The tabulation, based on figures from directors, is as follows:

d. I now believe that institutes for trainers of teachers are less desirable than I thought when I applied to this one, and I recommend against their continuation. d. 4

The vote of the responding participants, then, was 218 to 4 in favor of continuation of institutes for trainers of teachers. Nearly two-thirds (148 of 222) recommended only minor modifications in the type of institute they were attending.

Comments from staff members and from participants during interviews confirmed the general impression that these 1966 institutes were filling an important need. Here are some representative (paraphrased) statements by participants:

"Excellent idea." (Repeated over and over.)

"Participants in these institutes can influence more people, at least indirectly, than can participants in others."

"Work with trainers of teachers is the obvious place to begin."

"Special institutes for supervisors would also be a good idea."

"A premium should be put on such institutes."

"A very worthwhile summer."

"Though this institute was weak in many respects, the idea is sound."

"I'm moderately favorable."

"Such institutes should be expanded."

"Probably the most important kind of institute possible."

"The best thing that has happened to the profession in a long time."

"Such an institute is open-ended."

"At the heart of the problem."

"Excellent, but a mold for all such institutes would not be desirable."

"I wish every teacher of teachers who has fifteen years of experience could get in."

"We need other such institutes for other college teachers, too."

"The interdisciplinary emphasis is very rewarding."

"These institutes put the horse before the cart--where it belongs."

"Key people need to know of the changes that are occurring."

"Such institutes should reduce the need for retraining elementary and secondary school teachers."

"For more institutes like this I'd be willing to pay higher taxes, if necessary."

"If well done, definitely worth doing."

"Such institutes are pivotal, crucial. The methods teacher is the most important person in the field."

The seven visitors were urged to go with open minds into the nine institutes, without deciding in advance whether or not such institutes are desirable. If they were open-minded at the beginning, they were not after their visits. Though they found many ways, large and small, in which institute programs might be improved, without exception they came away convinced that institutes for trainers of teachers should be continued. As one of them put it, "There is no doubt in my mind that an institute of this nature is a great idea. College teachers of future teachers should be the best available, and should be capable of motivating, inspiring, leading, and informing their students. Institutes can help."

More revealing than votes of confidence or testimonials, though, is participants' checking of the ways in which, back home, they expect to use what they have learned. Here is the tabulation:

P-78. As a result of this institute, do you think that you may later want to

a. write a proposal for an institute? a. 62

b. direct an institute? b. 56

c. teach in an institute? c. 119

d. be a participant in a more advanced institute? d. 162

e. write text materials? e. 50

f. write articles? f. 80

g. give speeches? g. 59

h. conduct basic research? h. 69

i. conduct applied research? i. 70

j. develop special projects? j. 113

k. develop A-V materials? k. 106

l. develop curriculums? l. 104

m. develop improved supervisory practices? m. 96

n. make changes in a methods course? n. 130

o. make changes in an academic course? o. 134

If only a fourth or a third of the participants do what they say they want to do, the impact on the profession will be solid.

Participants responded to another question in this way:

P-75. When you return home from the institute, to what extent do you expect to make use of what you are studying this summer?

a. Great 144
b. Moderate 80
c. Slight 13
d. Not at all 2

Some persons who checked b or c suggested that the word studying had influenced their vote, and that they might have voted for a if the question had been phrased "to what extent do you expect to make use of what you are gaining from the total institute experience?"

Interviews showed still more uses that participants plan for their newly gained or reinforced knowledge. One person, for example, was already planning a series of "little institutes" in his own state. Many forecast substantial changes in the courses they teach, often to include new materials, content, techniques, or organization that they had learned about in the institute. A substantial proportion of supervisors and critic teachers expected to employ new techniques. Some participants planned to assume leadership in basic curricular reorganization. A state education department representative planned to dissiminate state-wide, to teachers of the hearing impaired, basic information and practical suggestions gleaned from his institute. Another person was preparing a bibliography for wide dissemination. Still another, who already has written extensively, was planning a series of professional articles because "new ideational doors have been opened for me." Another expected to use his knowledge in a pending institutional self-study in his college. --And so the responses went, on and on, some specific, some general, but with almost no exceptions, the participants felt that they would indeed put to practical use much of what they had learned.

Staff members and directors estimated the following as the most likely uses to be derived from the institutes:

DS-62. How are participants most likely to use what they are learning? (Check as many as are applicable.)

a. Modification of the courses they offer as teachers	a. 41
b. As supervisors, in working with teachers	b. 35
c. As critic teachers, in working with prospective teachers	c. 27
d. Conducting institutes	d. 13
e. Writing textbooks	e. 10
f. Preparing A-V aids	f. 30
g. In-service education	g. 33
h. Conducting field trips	h. 12
i. Demonstrations	i. 24
j. Speeches and articles	j. 19
k. Revising college programs for teacher preparation	k. 26
l. Laboratory work	l. 11
m. Conducting basic research	m. 6
n. Conducting applied research	n. 17
o. Developing curriculum	o. 30
p. Other (specify)	p. 2

An institute by-product may also be its impact upon the future work of the director and staff members. They were asked:

DS-84. To what extent are you yourself likely to use approaches, insights, materials, etc., that the Institute has brought to your attention?

a. Extensively a. 33

b. Occasionally b. 12

c. Slightly c. 1

d. Nothing unfamiliar has come to my attention d. 1

RECOMMENDATION 1: Institutes for trainers of teachers should be continued in future years, and the number of such institutes should be larger than in 1966--perhaps a total of about twenty such institutes each year, divided among various subjects.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE INSTITUTES

1. Number of participants.

In these institutes, the range in number of participants was from 24 to 50. Participants and staff were asked whether they considered the number in their own institute too large, too small, or about right. Most participants (217 of 243 respondents) considered the number about right; 23 said it was too large; 3 too small. Twenty-three staff members thought the number about right; two too small.

Concerning the institute with the largest enrollment (50), though, a substantial minority of participants (16 of 46 respondents) and of staff (2 of 5) thought the number too large.

RECOMMENDATION 2: An average of about 30 participants appears about right for these institutes. Any figure above 40 should be seriously questioned.

2. Duration of the institute.

Participants and staff were in general satisfied with the length of the institute in which they were involved, though the range among institutes was from 3 to 8 weeks. Only 3 of 46 staff respondents considered their institute too long; 5 thought it too short; and 38 considered it about right.

For the 3-week Columbia institute (English for the hearing impaired) participants voted for 4 weeks as the ideal time. For the 6-week Carnegie institute (history), the typical participant thought 5 weeks would be ideal; and Tulane (history) participants thought that its 8 weeks might better be 7. (Two Tulane staff members also voted for a 6- or 7-week session.) Participants and one staff member at the Arizona (media) institute favored 7 weeks rather than the 8 which it lasted. The 8-week session of the UCLA (TESL) institute was judged ideal by all staff and most participants. The Minnesota institutes (English, FL, and geography) each lasted 7 weeks. Four staff members in these three institutes thought the term too short, but participants would favor 6 weeks for FL and 6 1/2 weeks for geography, but would keep the 7 weeks for English. The 8-week session of the Wyoming (reading) institute was favored by most participants and by 5 of 7 responding staff members; the other two staff members voted for 6 and 7 weeks.

No recommendation is made here, though the figures suggest that 8 weeks may be too long for most such institutes and 3 weeks too short.

3. Schedule.

With little variation, participants agreed that institutes should meet 5 days a week. A fairly large minority, however, said that too much of their time was tightly scheduled. They reported the average number of hours scheduled per day as between 5 and 6, with a range from 3 to 8. Eleven participants thought the number too short, and 128 about right, but 105 thought the number too great. In interviews, it became clear that most of these 105 participants were not objecting to the workload. Instead, they wanted more time to talk on professional matters with other participants, to exchange ideas and information, and to read independently. Again and again they said that the interaction with their fellows was proving as helpful to them as the content of their courses and lectures, and that they would appreciate more opportunity for such interaction.

Participants' responses to other questions pertaining to schedule were as follows:

P-21. The planned extra-curricular or social events in connection with your institute average how many hours a week? 2 (Aver)

P-22. This number is
a. too large 13
b. too small 77
c. about right 145

P-23. Extra-curricular or social events for participants like those in this institute
a. are important 149
b. are only slightly important 58
c. need not be planned 40

P-24. Is there sufficient time for study and independent reading in an institute week?
a. Yes 134
b. No 109

P-25. Is there sufficient time for recreation and personal matters in an institute week?
a. Yes 140
b. No 96

P-26. How demanding of time and effort is the institute outside the scheduled hours?
a. Much too demanding 27
b. Very demanding 91
c. Fairly demanding 122
d. Not demanding enough 16

Staff members estimated the number of weekly hours of extra-curricular activities as 2 3/4. They agreed (36 to 5) with the majority of participants that such activities are important. Staff members were not asked questions comparable to P-24, P-25, and P-26.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Future planners of such institutes should consciously attempt to facilitate interaction among participants, partly by providing adequate conveniently located space, perhaps with access to coffee and soft drinks.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Extra-curricular or social events averaging 2 or 3 hours a week, probably not more, should be planned.

4. Mechanics of operation.

Participants' responses to questions concerning mechanics of operation were as follows:

P-4.	Were you able to find satisfactory hoursing?	Yes	230
		No	14
P-28.	Before the institute did University and institute personnel attend promptly to any important corresondence related to the institute	Yes	218
		No	26
P-29.	Have stipends been paid promptly?	Yes	239
		No	7
P-30.	Did registration for the institute appear reasonably simple? E.g., did it require no more than two or three hours?	Yes	229
		No	15
P-31.	Advance planning for the functioning of the institute appears to have been		
		a. careful and inflexible	25
		b. careful but suitably flexible	142
		c. fairly good	54
		d. poor	24
P-32.	Do the Director and staff appear to have enough help to carry out their responsibilities efficiently?	Yes	214
		No	27

In interviews, participants sometimes made comments relative to P-31. In general they appreciated careful advance planning which nevertheless permitted some degree of flexibility, so that, for example, if one part of the planned work required more time or less time, the schedule could be modified.

Directors observed that they had not found it necessary to make any substantial changes in their plan of operation. In connection with secretarial help, the typical institute staff had one full-time secretary who was employed specifically to work for the institute for a total of about six months. Some found it necessary to employ additional part-time or temporary help. Eight of the nine directors said that they had adequate secretarial assistance.

RECOMMENDATION 5: Planning prior to an institute should obviously be careful, but provision should be made for modest changes of program or emphasis once the institute is under way.

5. Participants' reactions to staff.

P-33. Do the Director and staff appear to function well together as a team?

Yes	226
No	12

P-34. The Director and staff seem well qualified for conducting this institute,

a. without exception	138
b. with one exception	70
c. with major exceptions	26

P-35. If weaknesses are evident in Director or staff, they are mainly in (Check as many as are applicable)

a. lack of depth in subject matter	15
b. inability to present material well	64
c. inability to translate theory into practice	56
d. lack of awareness of new developments	3
e. lack of awareness of A-V aids, etc.	14
f. lack of awareness of participants' needs or perspectives	106
g. other (specify)	41

P-36. If consultants such as publishers' representatives or government employees have been used, their contributions have been generally

a. excellent	40
b. good	57
c. fair	28
d. poor	10
e. (not used)	65

P-37. If paid consultants (e.g., professor brought in for one or two lectures) have been used, their contributions have been generally

a. excellent	114
b. good	98
c. fair	24
d. poor	5
e. (not used)	3

P-38. If any consultants were used, the coordination of their presentations within the framework of the institute was generally

a. excellent	87
b. good	97
c. fair	44
d. poor	6
e. (not used)	8

P-39. The attitude of the Director and staff toward participants was generally

a. excellent	161
b. good	61
c. fair	14
d. poor	3

During interviews, comments relevant to P-35 were frequently made. Almost never did participants question their professors' knowledge of the subject or their awareness of recent scholarship and materials. Some of the participants, though, since they themselves were highly experienced and no doubt generally successful teachers, were critical of the manner of presentation; they commented on mumbling lecturers, on excessive emphasis on the lecture method, and on occasional lack of clarity. Note, however, that the indictment was by no means universal; in fact, more than three fourths of the participants thought that material was usually presented effectively.

Almost forty per cent of the participants thought that at least some of their professors were insufficiently aware of participants' needs, purposes, or perspectives. This judgment was borne out by interviews with a few professors who, though obviously well qualified in their subjects, saw no difference between the institute participants and students in their regular graduate courses; therefore they taught as if no difference existed. Several of these professors did not know clearly why the participants were on the campus, so they obviously made no attempt to gear instruction to this very special group. A few participants were rather bitter about this point, sometimes saying that one or another professor treated them--almost if not quite his professional peers--as if they were freshmen.

Once more the criticism should not be exaggerated. It referred to no more than one or two staff members in any institute. Sixty per cent of the participants did not voice the objection at all. But the forty per cent deserve to be heard.

In one institute the re-assignment of a key staff member resulted in his share of the instruction being offered by highly able graduate assistants. The participants, though they respected the graduate assistants and tried to cooperate, were unhappy with the arrangement. They felt indignant that they--some of them themselves associate professors or professors--were being taught by persons of considerably lower status.

About half the participants in one institute were ready for advanced work in a technical subject offered by one professor. The other half hardly knew the basic vocabulary. Obviously the professor had a problem. He "solved" it by gearing instruction to the advanced group; the other half sat there, comprehending almost nothing. Participants suggested that a better arrangement would have been for the professor to assign readings to the advanced group and to meet with this group in seminar sessions once or twice a week; the remainder of the time could have been spent with the group requiring instruction in fundamentals.

In general, despite the misgivings of some participants, the attitude toward directors and staff members was extremely favorable. Many participants spoke of the "superhuman devotion," the "brilliant teaching," the "hard work," the "bottomless depths of knowledge" of their faculty. Many praised the openmindedness of the faculty, their willingness to experiment and to entertain new ideas. On the whole, then, the participants were not only appreciative but enthusiastic.

RECOMMENDATION 6: Planners of future institutes for trainers of teachers should make every effort to let staff members know that special planning is required to meet the needs of participants who are considerably more sophisticated than typical graduate students or participants in "regular" institutes.

6. Reactions to participants.

A fine spirit of friendliness and mutual helpfulness was apparent among participants, most of whom were on a first-name basis by the times the institutes were visited. They frequently exchanged ideas, information, bibliographies, course outlines, and the like, and they fraternized during and outside of institute hours.

Several questions sought other participants reaction to their fellows:

P-40. How homogeneous in interests and backgrounds is the group of participants selected for this institute?

Too homogeneous	5
Satisfactorily homogeneous	189
Not homogeneous enough	52

P-41. Do you believe that all or most participants in such an institute should be highly homogeneous in background and in the type of work they do? (E.g., all should be methods teachers in English, or all should be supervisors of reading, etc.)

Yes 96
No 146

P-42. Would there be considerable advantage in having mixed backgrounds and types of work represented in the participants? (E.g., academic professors, Education professors, supervisors, state department of Education personnel)

Yes 163
No 76

P-43. Is the composition of the group of participants in keeping with the announced objectives of the institute?

Yes 216
No 26

Directors and staff were asked these related questions:

DS-26. Do you believe that in general the participants are the sort who can profit substantially from the work of your institute?

Yes 42
No 0
Many but not most 5

DS-28. The average level of background and ability of the participants, in terms of what you anticipated, is

Higher 7
Lower 6
About as expected 36

DS-29. How would you describe the general appraisal of the institute by the participants at this time?

Enthusiastic 6
Highly favorable 29
Favorable 11
Lukewarm ____
Disappointed ____

DS-32. Do you consider it advisable in an institute for trainers of teachers to have geographical limitations on participation?

Yes 5
No 39

DS-33. Is it possible and desirable to ensure considerable homogeneity of background in the participants in this kind of institute? E.g., in similarity of jobs, in educatonal level.

Yes 19
No 24

DS-34. In your opinion is it (would it be) desirable to have in the same institute college methods teachers, college subject-matter specialists, supervisors, and high school critic teachers, or at least some mixture of such diverse groups?

Yes 33
No 12

RECOMMENDATION 7: Although great heterogeneity of participants would cause too serious problems, the interchanges that result from variety of background, geographical location, and professional interests make a reasonable amount of heterogeneity desirable in institutes for trainers of teachers.

7. Intra-staff working arrangements.

Directors and staff members responded to these questions:

DS-10. Staff members were informed of the rules, procedures, division of responsibilities, and general conduct of the institute by (check one or more)

a. helping to plan the proposal	a. 17
b. informal or formal conferences some weeks before the opening	b. 33
c. mail and telephone	c. 31
d. planning session just before the opening	d. 28
e. other (specify)	e. 9

DS-11. The method(s) named in 10 was(were)

	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
effective	5	22	17	19	6
fairly effective	2	8	11	5	3
not very effective			2	1	

DS-14. During the institute, staff members hold scheduled meetings to discuss problems, next steps, use of materials, course content, etc.

daily	9
occasionally	11
weekly	14
less than weekly	11
not at all	3

DS-15. Should staff meetings be regularly scheduled?

Yes 29
No 16

DS-16. If you answered Yes to 15, how often should regular staff meetings be held?

Daily	8
Weekly	21
Other (specify)	

DS-17. Do the Director and staff members sit in on the sessions conducted by the other staff members?

Regularly	23
Occasionally	23
Never	

DS-18. In an ideal institute for trainers of teachers, should the Director and other staff members regularly sit in on the sessions of the others?

Yes	29
No	13

DS-19. To what extent do classes, seminars, and workshops represent joint faculty effort?

Very largely	14
Largely	14
Somewhat	12
Little	1

The following questions were among those prepared for directors only, but were also answered by one co-director:

D-9. What percentage of your time during the institute is budgeted for your work in the institute? 80% (average)

D-10. In a typical week of the institute, how many total hours do you devote to institute responsibilities? 61 (average)

D-11. Do you yourself teach regularly in the institute?

Yes	6
No	4

D-12. Ideally, should the Director in such an institute teach regularly?

Yes	6
No	4

D-13. Is there an Associate Director or Co-director?

Yes	8
No	2

D-14. If so, does the Associate Director or Co-director teach?

Yes	8
No	

D-16. Approximately how many hours a week does each institute staff member teach? 15 (average

D-17. Do you and your staff consider institute teaching more onerous and demanding than ordinary teaching?

Yes 7
No 3

D-18. Do you consider either yourself or your staff overworked in the institute?

I am 3
I am not 6
My staff is 2
My staff is not 6

D-19. Who nominated you as Director?

I did 6
A superior did 3

D-20. Are your major interests and experience in the field of this institute?

Yes 9
No 1

D-21. What previous experience, if any, have you had in directing institutes?

(All had some experience; 5 had directed.)

D-22. Who chose the institute staff?

Director 8
Others 3

D-23. Most of the staff are from

this university 6
outside 2

The answers to these two groups of questions suggest, first, that the amount of staff involvement varied considerably from institute to institute. It would not be fair to say that in any of the nine institutes did the staff customarily just teach a class and then dash out the door, though a few professors did just that. The estimated average of 15 hours a week per staff member, which probably includes not only teaching but also conferences, sitting in on the classes of other professors, and other meetings with participants, is a most respectable figure. Observations and interviews during the visits showed that a high proportion of the staff were very deeply involved in institute matters, giving them much more time than they probably gave a regular graduate class. A subjective judgment is inescapable here: The most successful institutes were those in which the highest proportion of faculty members were very deeply involved. Such involvement is not merely a matter of time spent. It may also include helping to plan the proposal, meeting at least once a week with other staff members, regularly or at least occasionally sitting in on the classes of others, planning jointly all parts of the institute that are not clearly the province of one individual, and helping to mesh the diverse activities of the institute.

Another conclusion from the replies to these questions is that teaching in or directing an institute is hard work, though in interviews most directors and staff said that it was challenging and rewarding enough that they would like to do it again. Directors are especially busy people, as the 61-hour work week reveals. That this figure is probably not an exaggeration was confirmed by some of the visitors, one of whom reported that during one of his days there the director was on duty at 7:30 a.m. and was still at work at 11:00 p.m.

RECOMMENDATION 8: Planners of future institutes would be wise to involve their staff members as early and as fully as possible. Getting them to help plan the proposal is an especially good way, which may be supplemented in other ways suggested in the second paragraph above. Because of the time required by deep involvement, whenever possible the key staff members should have no other major commitments during the weeks of the institute.

RECOMMENDATION 9: Because of the director's heavy load, he should not have a sizable teaching burden in the institute. Participants want and should have an opportunity to hear him frequently, but this does not necessitate his teaching every day.

RECOMMENDATION 10: Consultants (visiting lecturers, demonstrators, etc.) may make excellent contributions to such institutes and should be extensively used to broaden perspectives, even though they may not always be available at the most suitable times.

8. Content and procedures.

Both participants and staff were asked a number of questions about the content of the institute, attempts to relate theory to practice, and reactions to the instructional procedures used. Participants responded as follows to this group of questions:

P-52. What means are being employed to transfer theory into practice? (Check all that apply.)

a. Seminars	a. 173
b. Small group sessions	b. 164
c. Individual reports ("This works for me.")	c. 140
d. Theory and practice interwoven in lectures	d. 166
e. Role-playing	e. 40
f. Demonstrations with adults	f. 62
g. Demonstrations with children	g. 76
h. Field trips	h. 140

i. A-V aids	i.	150
j. Special projects	j.	143
k. Laboratory work	k.	142
l. Other (specify)	l.	23

P-53. Of the items checked in 52, the most satisfactory in this institute appear to be (Check each letter that applies.)

a.	110
b.	73
c.	54
d.	90
e.	5
f.	22
g.	35
h.	52
i.	67
j.	68
k.	62
l.	11
m.	4

P-54. In the institute do you have opportunity to examine and evaluate textbooks and other printed instructional materials?

a. They are available for examination, but no guidance is given for evaluating them	a.	99
b. They are available, and guidance is given	b.	147
c. Few or none are available	c.	14

P-55. If your institute makes use of materials produced by curriculum study centers or by other publicly funded groups, these materails in general

a. are very useful	a.	57
b. are useful	b.	65
c. are useful in some instances	c.	58
d. are seldom useful	d.	7
e. should be ignored	e.	1

P-56. Do you believe that a good balance is being maintained between theory and practice?

a. Too much emphasis on theory	a.	75
b. Too much emphasis on practice: "gimmicky"	b.	14
c. Satisfactory balance	c.	153

P-57. Would you say that the emphasis is more on content (e.g., recent findings and theories in geography) or on method (e.g., how to teach teachers and prospective teachers of geography), or are the two about balanced?

a. Content	72
b. Method	38
c. Balance	123

P-58. Is the emphasis you indicated in 57 a wise one, in your opinion?

Yes	160
No	70

P-59. Does the course content often reflect satisfactory awareness of the contributions of related disciplines?

Yes	199
No	22

P-60. Is the course content realistically related to the institute's announced objectives?

Yes	188
No	39

P-61. Is the course content congruent with your expectations?

a. Yes	a.	110
b. More theoretical than I expected	b.	63
c. More practical than I expected	c.	17
d. I was misled	d.	21
e. I didn't know what to expect	e.	29

P-62. What is your reaction to the level of difficulty or sophistication on which most of the course content is pitched? (Mark one in each group.)

a. It is too high a level for me.	a.	19
b. It is too low a level for me.	b.	23
c. It is about right for me.	c.	190
d. It seems too high for most participants.	d.	30
e. It seems too low for most participants.	e.	16
f. It seems about right for most participants.	f.	176

P-63. What methods of presentation of course content are most effective in this institute? (Check 3 items.)

a. Lecture	a.	83
b. Discussion	b.	85
c. Lecture, followed by discussion	c.	154
d. A-V materials	d.	70
e. Demonstrations	e.	69
f. Field trips	f.	47
g. Individual reports	g.	47

h. Seminars	h.	90
i. Laboratory	i.	59
j. Other (specify)	J.	25

P-64. Was the presentation of new materials (A-V and other) carefully interwoven into the courses?

a. The coordination was excellent	a.	59
b. The coordination was fair to good	b.	103
c. New materials were not introduced in the courses, only in special sessions.	c.	40
d. New materials were dragged in helter-skelter.	d.	18
e. Materials were often not available at the most propitious time.	e.	28

P-65. If "seminars," "practicums," "circles," or "workshops" were used, they were generally (check all that apply)

a. stimulating	a.	88
b. informative	b.	137
c. an opportunity to exchange ideas	c.	150
d. well directed	d.	71
e. poorly conducted	e.	31
f. a waste of time	f.	15
g. (not used)	g.	13

P-66. Does the total program of the institute afford enough variety to maintain interest, but still avoid a scattered, unsystematic effect?

a. Good variety	186
b. Monotonous	21
c. Scattered	36

The directors and staff were asked a number of different but related questions:

DS-35. Your institute puts special emphasis on (Check all applicable items, and rank the two most important.)

a. Increasing participants' knowledge of subject matter	a.	38
b. Improving their conduct of methods courses	b.	17
c. Introducing new concepts	c.	38
d. Introducing new materials	d.	37
e. Assisting supervisors in their duties	e.	14
f. Assisting critic teachers in their duties	f.	9
g. Demonstrating equipment	g.	23
h. Improving laboratory skills	h.	22
i. Developing materials	i.	25
j. Other (specify)	j.	9

(Items c and a were given the highest rank.)

DS-39. The materials (textbooks, equipment, etc.) that you are using in the institute are

a. excellent 15
b. good 26
c. fair 4
d. poor or inadequate 1

DS-40. How have you supplemented the materials you originally planned to use?

a. Gifts from publishers, etc. a. 37
b. Borrowing from library or other college sources b. 33
c. Contributions from participants c. 16
d. Contributions from staff d. 30
e. None needed e. 2
f. Other (specify) f. 14

DS-41. In general, how familiar with your institute materials were the participants before they came to you?

a. Familiar with most a. 1
b. Familiar with quite a few b. 25
c. Largely unfamiliar c. 23

DS-42. Are you developing new materials in your institute?

Yes 31
No 14

DS-43. If you answered Yes to 42, the kinds of materials you are developing are (check all that are pertinent.)

a. bibliographies a. 24
b. sourcebooks b. 4
c. units for teacher use c. 20
d. tests d. 13
e. audio-visuals (specify) e. 19
f. course outlines f. 20
g. curricular guides g. 14
h. laboratory manuals h. 2
i. other (specify) i. 12

DS-44. If you answered Yes to 42, the method of development most used is

a. by individual participants a. 25
b. by small groups b. 17
c. by large groups c. 4

d. by director and staff	d. 8
e. by a and d	e. 3
f. by b and d	f. 2
g. by c and d	g. 0

DS-45. What contributions have new or recently published materials made to your program?

a. Useful for supplemental information	a. 18
b. Used as a large and intrinsic part of the program	b. 30
c. Uneven in quality and difficult to work into the program	c. 3

DS-46. To what extent are the newer media (television, etc.) important in your institute?

Very	20
Fairly	10
Only slightly	16

DS-47. To what extent are you drawing upon materials prepared in USOE curriculum study centers or other publicly supported programs for curriculum development?

Heavily	2
Considerably	7
Slightly	24
Not at all	10

DS-48. How well do you believe the institute instruction in general has been meeting the needs of the participants?

Very well	26
Well	21
Fairly well	1
Not well	0

DS-49. Is most of the instruction on a level of sophistication appropriate to the participants?

Yes	46
No, too high	0
No, too low	0

DS-50. Have you found it more difficult than in other teaching to pitch the instruction at the proper level for these participants?

Yes	7
No	32

DS-51. The work load of the participants seems

about right	40
too heavy	5
too light	0

DS-52. Do these participants seem as willing to work as hard as do participants in "regular" institutes?

a. Willing to work harder	a. 15
b. Willing to work as hard	b. 23
c. Less willing to work hard	c. 2
d. No opportunity to compare	d. 8

DS-53. What methods of instruction seem to work best with these participants? (Check 3-5)

Lecture	33
Discussion	42
Demonstration	25
Inductive methods	8
Films, etc.	9
Field trips	12
Small groups	22
Seminar	22
Laboratory	17
Practice teaching	15
Observation	12
Other (specify)	3

DS-54. How suited is the content of the institute to the background and needs of the participants?

Well suited	37
Fairly well	9
Not well	0

One conclusion to be drawn from the responses to the numerous questions in these two groups is that the types of instruction used were extraordinarily varied and that participants had their special favorites among the types. They regarded lectures combined with related discussion as the most effective method of presentation, followed at a distance by seminars, discussions, and lectures, and with fairly substantial numbers expressing specific approval of A-V materials, demonstrations, laboratory, field trips, and individual reports. Faculty members thought discussion sessions most useful, followed by lectures, demonstrations, small groups, and seminars. (The two sets of responses are not strictly comparable; both groups should have been given exactly the same choices here, but they were not.) Perhaps the most significant point is that activities in which the participants could themselves engage, such as discussion groups and seminars, were more highly regarded than passive listening or viewing.

For translation of theory into practice, the largest number of participants regarded seminars as most useful, followed by lectures that interwove theory and practice and then by a cluster including small group sessions, special projects, A-V aids, laboratory work, and individual reports. Relatively few participants thought highly of role-playing and demonstrations with adults, but nearly half of those who were exposed to demonstrations with children listed this activity as one of the most satisfactory. The answers to P-53, translated into percentages of those who checked as one of the most satisfactory an activity to which they had been exposed, were as follows:

Seminars	63.6%
Theory and practice interwoven in lectures	54.2%
Special projects	46.8%
Demonstrations with children	46.1%
A-V aids	44.7%
Small group sessions	44.5%
Laboratory work	43.7%
Individual reports	38.6%
Field trips	37.1%
Demonstrations with adults	35.5%
Role-playing	12.8%

The answers to P-54 through P-58 show that most participants found satisfactory the introduction to new materials and that they considered useful the materials from curriculum study centers and other publicly funded groups. The answers suggest also that participants like a balance between theory and practice. Staff members (DS-39) in general approved of the materials they had available for use, though only a third considered the materials excellent. The answers to P-64 suggest that participants did not regard very highly the way that new materials were introduced in some of the institutes.

The answers to P-65 re-emphasize the favorable inclination of the participants toward seminars and other instructional methods in which they themselves played an active part.

All but one of the institutes reported that staff or participants or both were developing new materials in the institute. (The exception was the 3-week institute, and even there, as interviews revealed, some participants were developing materials on their own.) The answers to DS-43 reveal that development of bibliographies was the most frequent of such activities, followed rather closely by units for teachers' use, course outlines, and A-V materials, and followed more distantly by curricular guides and tests, and a few miscellaneous materials. Most of the development was by individual participants or by small groups.

RECOMMENDATION 11: Planners of future institutes should attempt to make extensive use of seminars, discussion keyed to lectures, small group discussion, and other activities in which participants have an active role. This does not mean, of course, that lectures should be eliminated or even reduced by half, but these relatively sophisticated participants do welcome many opportunities to share with others their own knowledge and experience.

RECOMMENDATION 12: The careful blend of theory and practice illustrated in most of these 1966 institutes should be continued, though obviously the porportions will have to vary from institute to institute.

RECOMMENDATION 13: The presentation of new materials should be interwoven as well as possible into the general structure of the institute, not be made at random.

RECOMMENDATION 14: The development of new materials, though not equally appropriate for all institutes, should be considered as potentially very important. Even though the materials may often not be completed during the institute itself, participants will have a foundation upon which they can continue the building on their own time.

9. Miscellaneous.

Participants and staff were asked questions about grades and credit. Participants' questions and responses were as follows:

P-67.	Do you expect to receive a grade or grades as a result of your work in the courses, etc.?	Yes	139
		No	105
P-68.	As a trainer of teachers, do you want grades for the course and the institute?	Yes	82
		No	68
		Doesn't matter	91
P-69.	Would you be as well motivated without grades?	Yes	229
		No	10
P-70.	If grades are to be given, they will probably be based upon (check all that apply)	examinations	58
		papers	112
		oral work	90
		special projects	107
		other (specify)	27
P-71.	If grades are to be given, the methods of evaluation seem	fair	102
		unfair	4
		faulty in emphasis	10
		obscure	68
P-72.	Do you expect to receive academic hours (or units) of credit for your work?	Yes	147
		No	95
P-73.	As a trainer of teachers, do you want academic credit?	Yes	149
		No	86
P-74.	Would you be as well motivated without credit?	Yes	206
		No	29

These replies suggest that participants as a group do not particularly care whether or not they receive grades or credit.

Some pointed out, though, that they hope to apply institute credit toward an advanced degree. Perhaps the practice followed in some institutes of making credits and grades optional is a wise one.

Directors and staff had mixed feelings about grades and credit:

DS-65. Do participants in this kind of institute object to tests and the usual evaluation methods?
Yes 20
No 14

DS-66. Will participants be given a grade at the end of the institute?
Yes 29
No 12

DS-68. In your opinion, should grades be given to trainers of teachers?
Yes 21
No 21

DS-69. Is academic credit available to your participants?

a. Given to all who complete the work — a. 15
b. Available upon request — b. 28
c. Not given — c. 1

DS-70. Should academic credit be available to such participants?
Yes 42
No 4

Some of the consultants to the director of this study had suggested that possibly college-level participants or other trainers of teachers, who often have opportunities for remunerative professional employment in the summer, might be suffering substantial monetary losses by taking part in an institute, and that therefore questions might be raised about whether this was true and whether a different level of compensation should be recommended for the participants in institutes for trainers of teachers. Participants responded as follows:

P-49. Is it a financial sacrifice for you to attend this institute?
Yes 115
No 128

P-50. In your opinion would it be desirable and fair for trainers of teachers to be paid a larger stipend than is paid teachers who attend a "regular" institute? (Possibly a fixed per cent of the academic year salary)
Yes 123
No 112

Directors and staff were asked these questions:

DS-30. In your opinion would the average quality of your participants have been higher if the stipends had been higher?
Yes 6
No 38

DS-31. Would you react favorably to a suggestion that stipends for trainers of teachers be higher than for teachers in "regular" institutes?
Yes 12
No 30

These answers suggest that, though the question need not be dropped permanently, there is at present no strong reason for advocating different stipends for participants in institutes for trainers of teachers.

Staff members were asked about instructional facilities and related matters. In general the complaints were few, as the following tabulations reveal:

DS-71. Do Director and staff have adequate office facilities for conferences, etc.?
Yes 35
No 11

DS-72. Are classroom facilities adequate?
Excellent 13
Good 27
Fair 4
Poor 4

DS-73. Do participants in general appear satisfied with their housing?
Yes 39
No 6

DS-74. Are participants required to reside in designated dormitories, etc.?
Yes 7
No 40

DS-75. Should they be?
Yes 8
No 35

DS-76. Are some participants accompanied by their families?
Yes 44
No 1

DS-77. Is it desirable for participants in this kind of institute to be accompanied by their families?
Yes 14
No 20

DS-78. Were arrangements made for the participants to take a fairly high proportion of their meals together?
Yes 24
No 18

DS-79. Are dining facilities generally adequate?
Yes 38
No 6

DS-80. Are there places other than their rooms where participants may work after institute hours, alone or in small groups?

Yes 43
No 1

DS-81. Is a special curriculum library or laboratory or the like available for your participants?

Yes 45
No 1

DS-82. If the answer to 81 is Yes, is the special facility used extensively by your participants?

Yes 40
No 4

DS-83. Do the participants make extensive use of the University library and other appropriate facilities?

Yes 35
No 10

Questions were also raised regarding ways of informing potential institute participants concerning the existence of institutes for trainers of teachers:

P-44. How did you first learn that the institute would be held?

a. Brochure from USOE	a. 45
b. Brochure from the institute	b. 97
c. A colleague	c. 60
d. A newspaper	d. 2
e. A professional journal	e. 41
f. A professional meeting	f. 8
g. Other (specify)	g. 24

P-45. Do you have reason to believe that some qualified and potentially interested persons did not know of the institute, or learned too late?

Yes 86
No 141

Directors and staff answered similar questions:

DS-22. How were possible participants in your institute informed about it? (Check as many as are pertinent.)

a. At professional conferences	a. 19
b. By special mailings to possibly interested college departments and school systems	b. 39
c. In professional journals	c. 20
d. By USOE mailings	d. 30
e. Other (specify)	e. 16

DS-23. What methods of informing possible participants do you consider most effective? (Check one or two.)

a. Professional conferences	a. 16
b. Special mailings	b. 31
c. Professional journals	c. 14
d. USOE mailings	d. 18
e. Other (specify)	e. 6

DS-24. Do you have reason to believe that a significant number of potential participants did not learn about your institute?

Yes 20
No 21

The only recommendation that grows from the replies to these miscellaneous questions is this:

RECOMMENDATION 15: Since brochures from the director appear to be the most effective way of calling these institutes to the attention of potential participants, such brochures should be sent to a carefully selected but large number of addressees. "Please post" announcements addressed to department heads and other leaders in the field appear to be among the most effective mailings.

REACTIONS TO SPECIFIC INSTITUTES

In general the reactions to the 1966 NDEA institutes for trainers of teachers were overwhelmingly favorable. Those which follow, on specific institutes, have been selected from responses to the special questionnaires prepared for participants, from responses of staff and participants to oral interview questions, and from the impressionistic reports of the visitors. All these comments are phrased mainly in terms of what these well-informed participants especially liked or would have liked, though some of the comments are modified by the views of the staff or the visitors. The "recommendations" at the end of each presentation are not intended as judgments of the institute in question. They often reflect its strengths, sometimes its weaknesses, as suggested by the data, but all are phrased affirmatively. The intent is to make observations that may be helpful to planners of future institutes for trainers of teachers.

1. University of Arizona--Educational Media. Five of the six objectives of the Arizona institute were considered by participants to be of considerable importance. The objectives, listed here in order of the degree of approval, were as follows:

1. "To provide comprehensive knowledge of communication theories and their relation to teaching."
2. "To develop understanding and skill in the utilization of transparencies and slides."
3. "To increase knowledge of principles of innovation as applied to college teaching."
4. "To improve background and skill in selecting new educational media appropriate to your college teaching requirements."
5. "To improve your skill in using various classroom discussion techniques."

The sixth objective, "To develop reasonable skill in performing as a teacher on instructional television programs," was regarded with comparatively little favor.

The written questionnaire listed ten "program elements" of the Arizona institute and asked the participants to check each "high," "average," or "low" in regard to four criteria. The following table summarizes the responses. (See page 41.)

Participants appreciated the fact that in their home institutions most of them had or could get most of the materials to which the institute had introduced them. However, about 40 per cent of the resondents said that their institutions' funds would be insufficient to provide as many of the materials as they would like. Some participants also stated that in their own institutions they would not have ready access to needed equipment such as overhead projectors, slide projectors, filmstrip projectors, tape recorders, or videotape equipment.

Participants were asked "How available will be most of the services required to produce various kinds of educational media you would like to use in your classes next year (large transparencies, slides, audio videotape, recordings, and the like)?" Ten respondents said "Most," 7 said "Some," 7 said "Little," and 12 said "None."

Participants responded as follows to these questions:

6. As a result of your institute experiences this summer, what specific actions do you expect to take in your program for the next academic year? (Please use check marks to indicate your selections.)

   a. Use more films than previously. a. 29
   b. Use more filmstrips than previously. b. 20
   c. Use more large transparencies than previously. c. 38

	Probably usefulness of outcomes in your work with student teachers			Thoroughness and effectiveness of instruction			Degree of "newness" of content or experience for you personally			Quality and scope of audio-visual media used in connection with instruction in this area		
	H	A	L	H	A	L	H	A	L	H	A	L
1. Instructional Systems	17	20	2	21	23	1	29	15	1	10	24	11
2. Communication Theory	23	14	3	19	21	5	25	16	4	11	25	10
3. Learning Theory	24	13	3	33	11	1	22	20	3	8	24	12
4. Characteristics & Operation of A-V Equipment	26	15	1	23	17	5	19	17	10	20	17	8
5. Design & Prep. of Overhead Transparencies	28	12	2	34	8	4	31	12	3	31	8	6
6. Design & Prep. of Photographic Materials	15	20	7	9	30	7	22	19	5	9	30	7
7. Programed Instruction	12	28	1	23	21	2	28	17	1	12	25	8
8. Instructional Television	15	17	9	17	25	3	30	10	4	22	18	5
9. Innovation	21	17	3	15	26	5	24	19	3	10	24	12
10. Group Dynamics	12	17	9	10	21	9	8	23	9	6	20	4

d. Use more audio tape recordings than previously. d. 34

e. Use videotaping more frequently than previously. e. 14

f. Use group dynamics techniques more frequently than previously. f. 16

g. Work toward expanding the new media collections of your institution to include more items of the type encountered in this institute. g. 36

h. Work toward expanding the new media local production services in your institution to provide more media of the types encountered in this institute. h. 34

i. Develop a proposal for an investigation of some specific application of new media to problems of teacher education. i. 20

j. Other actions (please specify): j. 3

The following recommendations for future institutes, gleaned from questionnaire responses, interviews with participants and staff members, and the visitation, are in part an endorsement of procedures followed in this institute:

1. Choose relatively heterogeneous participants.
2. Employ ample assistants to handle logistics for the large amounts of equipment and materials needed.
3. The director should have a clear understanding of the extent of his authority. E.g., can he expel a trouble-making participant?
4. Early planning with other staff members is helpful.
5. Assistants should stay a couple of days beyond the institute to put equipment and materials in order.
6. Since a strenuous field trip was included, the required physician's statement concerning the good health of participants was useful.
7. Facilities should, if possible, all be in one building.
8. Programed instruction should be given considerable emphasis.
9. For photographic work, at least fifteen dark rooms should be available.
10. The number of hours a day and the number of weeks should not be excessive.
11. A follow-up involving actual visits to participants schools would be valuable.

12. Take precautions against theft of materials.
13. Emphasis on sharing of participants' knowledge should be stressed.
14. Stress on underlying theory is important.
15. Avoid busy work.
16. Limit the number of objectives. State objectives behavioristically.
17. Teach ITV via ITV, programed learning via programed learning, etc.
18. Give help on use of media in teaching subjects such as English, history, education.
19. A combination of theory with activity is excellent.
20. Place much emphasis on quality of work produced. Make clear what is expected of each participant in projects, skills, general quality. Devote time to orientation.
21. Be sure that plenty of equipment is available, in good condition.
22. Pay considerable attention to use of computers in instruction.
23. Avoid overlaps in instruction.
24. Teach procedures for sharing equipment.
25. (Comment from director). It may become necessary to determine whether media institutes shall be mainly production institutes for preparing materials or learning institutes, stressing theories and skills.

2. Carnegie Institute of Technology--History. Participants ranked the six stated objectives from most valuable to least valuable, as follows:

1. To provide an awareness of major trends in recent historiography, especially the influence of the social sciences.
2. To explore the nature and philosophy of history.
3. To study the historians' method of inquiry, especially as it relates to secondary level teaching.
4. To acquaint participants with inductive teaching techniques.
5. To update knowledge of recent interpretations in American and World History.
6. To introduce new materials suitable for inductive teaching at the secondary level.

The Carnegie institute provided laboratory observation in conjunction with the lecture and discussion sections. Participants reacted to the laboratory in these ways:

1.	The techniques being utilized are not new to me.	9
2.	The teaching techniques demonstrated are somewhat new to me.	10
3.	The teaching techniques being demonstrated are totally new to me.	3
4.	This laboratory program served to reinforce the objectives of the institute.	10
5.	The laboratory portion tended to negate the objectives.	2
6.	The availability of a full-time media specialist should be an integral part of an institute program.	12
7.	A full-time media specialist is not needed.	3

(n = 23)

A unique feature of the Carnegie institute was its pairing of instructors in college level methods courses with secondary school critic teachers. Participants reacted as follows to this pairing:

1.	Extremely helpful	8
2.	Helpful	11
3.	Unnecessary	5

Participants responded thus to other questions:

HCT-5. A major emphasis during the course of the institute is placed upon new materials. Please check the items below that represent your reactions to this feature of the program.

a.	Most of the materials are not new to me.	0
b.	At least part of the materials are new to me.	17
c.	The materials seem well selected for this purpose.	10
d.	The materials are not often well selected.	3
e.	The emphasis has been placed too exclusively upon books and other printed matter.	1
f.	Some of these materials emanate from the Project Social Studies Centers.	14
g.	A considerable portion of the materials are audio-visuals.	5
h.	In general, this focus has been worthwhile.	12

i. In general, the time spent on this focus should be devoted to other concerns. 0

j. I expect to use a major portion of these materials in my own teaching. 3

k. I shall probably use few of these new materials in my own courses. 13

HCT-7. In your home institution, how available will most of the useful new books, materials, and equipment be should you and your colleagues wish to use them?

a. We have most of these already and can purchase whatever else seems appropriate. 2

b. We have some of them and can get most of the others which seem necessary. 11

c. We have few of the items demonstrated but anticipate being able to get those needed. 7

d. Institutional funds will be insufficient to obtain any major portion of desired materials. 3

e. Our funds will be insufficient to obtain more than a very small portion of the materials desired. 2

f. Our institution will not look with favor upon the expenditure of funds for this purpose. 0

HCT-9. Has participation in this institute altered you in any of the following ways? (check those appropriate)

a. New intellectual interests 16

b. Revised conceptions of teaching 17

c. Altered plans for continuing education 3

d. Stimulated interest in professional activities 6

e. Experienced changes in attitude towards secondary teaching 4

f. Renewed enthusiasm for teaching 9

g. Widened acquaintance with interpretations of history 15

h. Increased awareness of the contributions of other social science disciplines 19

HCT-10. How do you anticipate using what you have learned this summer? (Check as many items as are appropriate.)

a. Modification of courses you currently offer 16

b. Introduction of new course offerings	2
c. Incorporation of new units of study in existing courses	14
d. Participation as a supervisor of student teachers	15
e. Instructorship in a social studies methods course	9
f. Service as director of subsequent institutes	4
g. Authorship of college or secondary level textbooks	2
h. Preparation of audio-visual aids	5
i. Planning programs of in-service education	10
j. Conducting field trips	3
k. Preparation of demonstration classes	6
l. Service as resource person for speeches and articles	9
m. Participation on college committees working to revise teacher preparation programs	9
n. Extensive participation in research activities appropriate to improving instruction	5
o. Consultantships with local school districts concerning social studies offerings	12
p. Basis for promotion (rank and/or salary) within your institution	0
q. Basis for joining another faculty in the near future	1
r. Other (specify)	1

Interviews and the visitor's impressions turned up the following recommendations, many of which are merely endorsements of the Carnegie operation:

1. Laboratory workshops and demonstration classes have an important role in such an institute and should be closely integrated with the other work.
2. A well-equipped reading room like that at Carnegie is highly desirable.
3. Participants appreciate familiarization with various social studies projects across the nation.
4. Ample opportunity for sharing the experience, knowledge, and reading of the participants is important.
5. Opportunity to encourage interaction between college methods teachers and secondary school critic teacher

is valuable, though sometimes the pairings at Carnegie were considered "shotgun marriages."

6. Attendance by some participants with previous institute experience provides enrichment.
7. Specific help in suggesting application (e.g., to college methods courses or to in-service education) is desirable.
8. A balance between theory and practice was commended by most participants. Some opportunity for them to teach was recommended by a few.
9. Involvement of school administrators was recommended by some participants.
10. The junior high school level should not be neglected.
11. A continuing staff is preferable to a large number of visiting lecturers, though some of the latter do broaden perspectives and add enrichment. The director and associate director should be closely identified with the instructional program.
12. Administrative care is needed to assure that institute participants pay no more for housing than do regular summer school students.
13. It is desirable in all publicity prior to the institute, especially in the principal brochure, to make completely clear the objectives and program of the institute.
14. An institute of an interdisciplinary type, focusing on problems in teaching all the social sciences, perhaps using history as the center, might have great value. However, there is a danger of spreading too thin in a 6-week institute.
15. Much of use to future institutes can be gleaned from follow-ups of institutes like the one at Carnegie.

3. Columbia University Teachers College--Applied linguistics for trainers of teachers of the hearing impaired. This most specialized of the nine institutes was also the shortest (3 weeks). The reactions of participants to the objectives and to the relative amounts of time spent on various components of the program are summarized in the following two tables: (n = 22.)

EC-1. Listed below are the stated objectives of this institute. By placing a check mark (✓) in one of the columns to the right, please indicate the degree to which, in your opinion, each objective is being achieved.

	Completely	For the most part	To some extent
a. "The basic objective of this institute is to improve the language instruction of hearing impaired children and thereby reduce their current academic retardation which markedly affects their social and vocational potential. Such an objective can best be accomplished by improving the quality of methods courses taught to potential teachers of the hearing impaired."	1	11	3
b. "To extend the knowledge of teacher trainers to the area of linguistic science which has relevance to the development of communication skills in hearing impaired children. Of the several schools of linguistics, transformational and generative grammar have been selected as most pertinent in enabling teachers to understand the deep structure of language and its relationship to the input of language."	11	8	3
c. "To develop new insights into the reciprocality of language development and function in the normal and in the hearing impaired."	7	11	4
d. "To encourage the development of language curriculum based on knowledge of the structure of language."	12	6	3
e. "To acquaint teacher trainers with both American and European acoustic pedagogical theories and practices."	7	7	8
f. "To demonstrate new techniques and electronic equipment for the study and improvement of communication skills: heard, spoken, and written and to encourage their use in teacher preparation centers."	15	6	0
g. "To stimulate research in developing and evaluating oral methods of instructing deal children."	7	9	4

EC-2. By placing a check mark in one of the columns to the right, please indicate your opinion as to the amount of time given to each curricular experience provided by this institute.

	Too much	Just right	Not quite enough	Not nearly enough
a. Sessions on audiology and communication	4	13	3	0
b. Sessions on tagmemics	0	12	9	1
c. Sessions on vocoders	2	18	1	0
d. Sessions on speech problems of the deaf	1	9	8	4
e. Laboratory sessions	8	10	2	2
f. Library assignments	4	12	5	0
g. Sessions on transformation/ generative grammar	2	13	3	3
h. Field trips	3	19	0	0
i. Sessions on audition, residual hearing, auditory training	4	11	5	1
j. Special lectures	0	21	0	1

Participants said that Item g in EC-2 would most likely have the greatest effect on their own work, followed by i and b. Most participants had little previous background in linguistics; in the last week of the institute they stated (17 to 3) that they now saw ways of applying linguistics extensively in the teaching of the hearing impaired, though they also said (16 to 5) that they felt the need for a much deeper grounding in linguistics than a tight 3-week schedule had made possible.

The following recommendations for future institutes, gleaned from the questionnaires, interviews with participants and staff members, and visitors' impression, are in part an endorsement of procedures followed in this institute:

1. Linguistic emphasis in teaching the hearing impaired is promising and deserves further exploration. An institute stressing linguistics alone would be welcomed by some participants. Phonology and the oral aspects of transformational theory need special emphasis for teachers of the deaf.
2. A sizable array of specialized equipment is essential for an institute of the TC type; some of it is very expensive. Participants should be familiarized with both the theory and use of such equipment.
3. Participants appreciate opportunity to practice application of theory, but find this difficult in three weeks.

4. Comparison of methods of teaching the hearing impaired is desirable.
5. Critical examination of text material is useful.
6. Opportunities for interaction among participants are highly desirable.
7. A follow-up institute would be useful (18 to 2).
8. Greater opportunity for get-togethers of teachers in this specialized field (outside of institutes) would be welcomed.
9. Objectives for such a short institute should not be too numerous.
10. Small seminar sessions for participants with special interests and backgrounds would be useful. E.g., for those interested in a certain kind of research.
11. Ample secretarial and technical help is important.
12. Flexibility of program is desirable.
13. Problems involved in the host institution's procedures for disbursement of funds should be anticipated and, if possible, solved before the institute begins.
14. Preparation of bibliographies for future use of participants is valuable.
15. Visiting lecturers, when as well qualified as those at TC, make an important contribution.
16. Four weeks, rather than three, would be approved by most participants and some staff, though many possible participants have summer responsibilities. Alternatively, the amount of content coverage might be reduced and the 3-week plan continued.
17. Suggestives for dissemination of the knowledge gained from the institute are welcomed.
18. There should be no geographical limitations on participants; the number of participants in a single institute of this type should probably not exceed 25.
19. Evening sessions should be avoided.

4. University of California (Los Angeles)--English as a foreign language. The UCLA institute stressed preparation of materials. It was coordinated with a linguistics institute at UCLA. Individual work, a special project, an elective course, demonstration classes, a seminar in materials production, and speeches by guest lecturers were included. The following answers to selected written questions reveal participants' reactions. (*n* = 29.)

EUC-10. The institute is concerned with the teaching of "the skills required for the production of 1) linguistically sound and 2) pedagogically valid teaching materials."

How would you evaluate the institute in light of this objective?

a. Too much emphasis on linguistics 4
b. Too much emphasis on pedagogy 3
c. A good balance adjusted to individual needs in integrated linguistic theory and practical experience and principles in pedagogy 19

EUC-11. How do you feel about using the development of teaching materials as a central theme for an NDEA institute in TESL?

a. Is too limited 1
b. Is suitable for an NDEA institute for advanced study in TESL and should be the established theme for future advanced NDEA institutes in TESL 10
c. Is suitable for an NDEA institute for advanced study in TESL but should not be the only established theme for future advanced institutes in TESL 12
d. Is suitable for an NDEA institute for general or advanced study in TESL or TEFL to meet current needs 4

EUC-13. It is stated in the proposal for this institute that "an ideal situation for materials production would have to provide access 1) to numerous experts for consultation and 2) to a large variety of courses for filling the lacunae in technical knowledge." Do you feel this ideal situation has been afforded you?

a. Yes 20
b. No (Specify main shortcoming(s)) 8

EUC-15. Have the consultants from the Linguistic Institute been readily available or has it been difficult to see them?

a. Readily available, with ample time for consultation 8
b. Available, but time too limited for much consultation 11
c. Difficult to make arrangements to see them 7

EUC-16. How would you evaluate the practical applications of sessions with consultants from the Linguistic Institute?

a. Good	6
b. Satisfactory	11
c. Too theoretical, of little practical value	5
d. Other (specify)	2

EUC-17. How would you evaluate the practical applications of content in courses elected in the Linguistic Institute?

a. Good	7
b. Satisfactory	9
c. Too theoretical, of little practical value	5
d. Other (specify)	4

EUC-19. Do you think that the participants in the NDEA institute have profited from the correlation with the Linguistic Institute?

a. Yes (Specify greatest value	16
b. No (Specify greatest shortcoming)	10

EUC-20. Judging from your experience this summer, which type of program for an NDEA Institute for Advanced Study in TESL do you think would be the best?

a. An independent NDEA institute program with a flexible curriculum providing a few electives and a generous amount of time for individual study	8
b. An independent NDEA institute program with a prescribed curriculum of courses scheduled for all or at least large groups of participants	4
c. A correlated NDEA-TESL and Linguistic Institute program with a flexible curriculum providing a broad selection of courses and a generous amount of time for individual study	9
d. A correlated NDEA-TESL and Linguistic Institute program with a prescribed curriculum of select courses for all or at least large groups of participants	7

EUC-23. How would you describe the total learning experience that the consultant sessions have afforded?

a. Very valuable	16
b. Rather valuable	8
c. Not valuable	4

EUC-24. What do you think about the amount of time allotted to these sessions?

a. About right	20
b. Not enough	8
c. Too much	

EUC-25. How have you distributed the weekly twenty hours allotted to individual creative work? Indicate approximate percentage of total time spent on each activity throughout the Institute?

a. Reading for my project	a. (about 50% aver.)
b. Writing on my project	b. (about 37% aver.)
c. Making tapes and/or visual aids	c. (about 13% aver.)
d. Other (Specify)	d. (about 1% aver.)

EUC-26. How would you evaluate the amount of time allotted to individual study?

a. About right	21
b. Too much	
c. Not enough	7

EUC-34. What do you feel that you have gained from the "shock course?" Check any that apply.

a. "Stretched" linguistic horizons	8
b. A good model of linguistically oriented materials	8
c. A good model of teaching procedure	9
d. Insights into a learner's role of a "zero speaker" in a foreign language	14
e. Nothing	6
f. Other (Specify)	2

EUC-35. What attempts have been made to correlate this course with the rest of the program? Check any that apply.

a. Discussion of the procedure and the materials, or at least allusions to them, in other sessions	5

b. Discussion of the linguistic items, or at least allusions to them, in other sessions	5
c. No attempt at correlation	18

EUC-36. What do you think about the amount of time allotted to this "shock" activity?

About right	9
Too much	15
Not enough	3

EUC-37. What do you think about the credit allotment of two units for this "shock course?"

a. About right	11
b. Too much (only one unit should be given)	4
c. Too much (no credit should be given)	8
d. Too little	

EUC-38. How much work outside of class has this "shock course" required?

A reasonable amount	15
Too much	10
None	1

EUC-39. In which type of NDEA institute in TESL or TEFL do you think such a "shock course" should be offered?

a. In the NDEA institutes for advanced study only	3
b. In the NDEA institutes for general study only	12
c. In both types of NDEA institutes	6
d. In neither type of NDEA institute	6

EUC-41. How closely has the content of your elective course been related to the rest of your program?

a. Very closely related, with a lot of applicable material	18
b. Closely related, with a satisfactory amount of applicable material	6
c. Somewhat related, with a few applicable principles or items	2
d. Not related or too slightly related to be of any use	2

EUC-42. How much outside work has this course entailed?

a. A reasonable amount	24
b. Too much	3
c. None	

EUC-46. Would you prefer receiving some credit for the elective course to earning all eight units in the seminar and the "shock course" in a new language?

a. Yes, I would like credit in the elective course instead of some or all of the credit in the "shock course"	15
b. Yes, I would like credit in the elective course instead of some of the credit in the seminar	4
c. No	3

EUC-47. How would you rate the effectiveness of the various activities assigned to the two-hour session of the demonstration classes in the instruction program? Use the 1 to 5 rating scale in which 1 = excellent and 5 = poor.

a. Observation of "a systematically developed course of instruction" the first hour	1
b. Opportunity for participants "to try out their experimental materials" the second hour	2.5
c. Opportunity "to discuss the success of the latter" experimentation	4

EUC-52. In the proposal for this Institute, the seminar in materials production is described as the "key course." Do you think the seminar has been a success in its key role for the Institute program?

a. Yes	23
b. No (Specify main shortcoming)	4

EUC-53. Rate the effectiveness of the following functions proposed for the seminar sessions. Use the 1 to 5 rating scale in which 1 = excellent and 5 = poor.

a. "Discussion of individual projects, problems, and accomplishments"	1.8
b. "Referral to appropriate courses, consultants, and reference materials"	2.3
c. "Criticism of results"	2.3

EUC-54. In the proposal for this institute, this seminar is described as the "only place where entire participant group meets together." Do you think that there should have been more group activity in the institute?

Yes	20
No	3

EUC-55. In your opinion, should all the participants attend the same seminar or should they be divided into separate interest groups according to educational levels and/or types of projects?

a.	Participants should meet all together for all the seminar sessions	7
b.	Participants should meet in separate interest groups for all the seminar sessions	2
c.	Participants should meet all together for some sessions of the seminar and in separate interest groups for other sessions of the seminar	14

EUC-58. What is your opinion concerning the number of lectures?

About right	22
Too many	5
Too few	1

EUC-59. What do you consider the real value of the project in the preparation of instruction as materials?

a.	The training in the preparation of material	25
b.	The materials actually produced	11

EUC-60. How would you rate the contribution of each of the following activities to the development of your project in the preparation of instructional materials? Use the 1 to 5 rating scale in which 1 = excellent and 5 = poor.

a.	Seminar reports and discussion	2.0
b.	Demonstration classes for participants' observation	2.6
c.	Demonstration classes for participants' experimentation	3.4
d.	Library collection of TESL and TEFL materials	1.6
e.	Facilities for making tapes and visual aids	2.2
f.	Regularly scheduled consultant sessions with institute staff	1.7
g.	Consultations with local consultants	2.5
h.	Consultations with Linguistic Institute staff	3.1
i.	Elective course	2.0
j.	"Shock course" in a new language	3.7
k.	Speeches by guest lecturers	2.9
l.	Informal discussions with participants outside of class	1.7
m.	Other (Specify)	0

C

EUC-61. Have you accomplished as much in your project as you expected?

Yes	12
No	17

EUC-62. If you have not accomplished as much as you expected, what do you regard as the main reason(s)?

a. Unrealistic goal	a. 5
b. Insufficient materials for private study	b. 1
c. Insufficient direction	c. 5
d. Insufficient theory to meet my particular needs	d. 6
e. Insufficient time	e. 12
f. Other (Specify)	f. 2

EUC-63. What do you expect to do with your project?

a. Publish it	a. 5
b. Use it in mimeographed form in my own classroom or educational system	b. 23
c. Do not expect to use it as instructional material; just regard it as a training project in the development of materials	c. 2
d. Other (specify)	d. 7

EUC-64. What follow-up assistance with your project would you like? Check any that apply.

a. Consultation by mail	a. 17
b. Consultation by personal visits	b. 10
c. One-day institutes or conference with NDEA Institute participants and consultants in the area	c. 10
d. On-Campus or extension in-service courses which provide class-centered on-the-spot discussion and direction of materials and procedures being developed and experimented with in the classroom.	d. 8
e. No follow-up assistance	e. 0
f. Other (specify)	f. 1

EUC-65. Of the types of follow-up assistance listed in EUC-64, which kind(s) do you expect to receive?

a. 16
b. 5
c. 6
d. 2
e. 3
f. 0

The following recommendations for future institutes, gleaned from questionnaire responses, interviews with participants and staff members, and the visitation, are in part an endorsement of the procedures followed in this institute:

1. Production of materials is an acceptable objective for such an institute but probably should not be the only objective. Guidance in selection of suitable projects is essential.
2. It is useful to have available a considerable variety of courses because of the diverse experience of the participants.
3. Co-existence of a linguistics institute on the campus is useful but not indispensable.
4. Participants appreciate opportunity for interaction.
5. Substantial amounts of time are needed for individual work.
6. Availability of a wide range of TESL and TEFL materials is essential. Reading rooms should be open on week-ends.
7. The value of a "shock course" is debatable. The majority of participants rated it low. Some would have preferred a less exotic language than Tagalog.
8. Seminars should be partly for the whole group, partly for separate interest groups.
9. Guest lecturers should be carefully selected.
10. Follow-up assistance, at least by mail, for the continuation of special projects, is desirable.
11. A careful first-day orientation is worth while.
12. Good demonstration teachers help. Various grade levels should be represented in demonstration classes.
13. Help should be provided in interpreting and using materials.
14. A number of participants would have liked more opportunity to study advanced linguistics.
15. If examinations are to be required, participants should be informed early in the institute.
16. Some participants would have liked practical instruction in preparing transparencies, tape loops, etc.
17. Instruction of bilingual children as well as an analysis of their problems should be discussed.
18. Some attention should be given to teaching content as well as linguistic structures.
19. Teaching ESL students in the United States should not be neglected; their needs and problems are not quite the same as those of students in foreign lands.

20. Objectives for such an institute should not be too broad and varied.
21. Perhaps the backgrounds of participants selected should be relatively homogeneous.
22. The possibility that samll groups might work together on projects should be explored.

5. University of Minnesota--English. Participants in this institute reacted as follows to these questions: (n = 23.)

EM-1. This institute was designed to cover the three areas listed below. Place a 1 after the area that you are finding most valuable, to you, a 2 after the next most valuable, and a 3 after the least valuable.

a. The English Language	2
b. Rhetorical Studies	1
c. Conducting and Interpreting Research	3

EM-2. Concerning the English language study, the institute brochure says that attention will be given to "such topics as grammars of English, regional and social dialects of English, lexicography, and history of the language." Are all these being covered in a fashion you consider adequate, given your own background?

Adequately	5
Skimpily	1
Unevenly	17

EM-3. In Rhetorical Studies, the institute promises to cover "concepts from classical and contemporary rhetoric and related concepts from communicaton theory, experimental rhetoric, and behavioral sciences." Are these being covered in a fashion you consider adeaute, given your own background?

Adequately	17
Skimpily	2
Unevenly	3

EM-4. In Research, the institute promises to cover "needed research, problems of designing and interpreting research, and possible applications of research evidence." Are these being covered in a fashion you consider adequate, given your own background?

Adequately	2
Skimpily	11
Unevenly	10

20. Objectives for such an institute should not be too broad and varied.
21. Perhaps the backgrounds of participants selected should be relatively homogeneous.
22. The possibility that samll groups might work together on projects should be explored.

5. *University of Minnesota--English*. Participants in this institute reacted as follows to these questions: (*n* = 23.)

EM-1. This institute was designed to cover the three areas listed below. Place a *1* after the area that you are finding most valuable, to you, a *2* after the next most valuable, and a *3* after the least valuable.

a.	The English Language	2
b.	Rhetorical Studies	1
c.	Conducting and Interpreting Research	3

EM-2. Concerning the English language study, the institute brochure says that attention will be given to "such topics as grammars of English, regional and social dialects of English, lexicography, and history of the language." Are all these being covered in a fashion you consider adequate, given your own background?

Adequately	5
Skimpily	1
Unevenly	17

EM-3. In Rhetorical Studies, the institute promises to cover "concepts from classical and contemporary rhetoric and related concepts from communicaton theory, experimental rhetoric, and behavioral sciences." Are these being covered in a fashion you consider adeaute, given your own background?

Adequately	17
Skimpily	2
Unevenly	3

EM-4. In Research, the institute promises to cover "needed research, problems of designing and interpreting research, and possible applications of research evidence." Are these being covered in a fashion you consider adequate, given your own background?

Adequately	2
Skimpily	11
Unevenly	10

EM-5. Concerning the "weekly workshop session on new teaching materials," please check items below that represent your reactions.

a.	Most of the materials are not new to me	1
b.	At least half of the materials are new to me	3
c.	The materials seem well selected	0
d.	The materials are often not well selected	1
e.	Many of the materials are books and other printed matter	4
f.	Many of the materials come from English curriculum centers (from EIMC)	7
g.	Many of the materials are audio-visual	0
h.	In general, these sessions are worth while	0
i.	In general, these sessions are not very worth while	6
j.	I can use quite a few of these materials in my own work	4
k.	I shall probably use few of these materials in my own work	3

EM-7. Concerning the "special lecture and film series, please check the item below that most nearly represents your reaction.

a.	The lectures and films present a wealth of new information and ideas	12
b.	They are occasionally useful	6
c.	They have little value	0

EM-10. The brochure announced "a weekly discussion with all participants and staff members meeting together." These discussions have been

very profitable	
fairly profitable	13
wasteful of time	7

EM-11. In your home institution, how available will most of the useful relatively new books, materials, and equipment be, should you and your colleagues wish to use them?

a.	We have most of them already, and can get whatever else seems appropriate	3
b.	We have some of them and can get most others which seem necessary	13

c.	We have few of them but can get most of those needed	4
d.	Our funds will be insufficient to obtain more than half of what I want	3
e.	Our funds will be insufficient to obtain more than a small portion of what I want	1

EM-13. Has participation in this institute altered you in any of the following ways? (Check those appropriate.)

a.	New intellectual interests	15
b.	Revised conceptions of teaching	9
c.	Altered plans for continuing education	3
d.	Stimulated interest in professional activities	4
e.	Experienced changes in attitude toward secondary teaching	3
f.	Renewed enthusiasm for working with younger teachers	2
g.	Widened acquaintance with parts of the English field	19
h.	Increased awareness of contributions of disciplines allied with English	21

EM-14. How do you anticipate using what you have learned this summer? (Check those appropriate?)

a.	Modification of courses you currently offer	12
b.	Introduction of new course offerings	4
c.	Incorporation of new units of study in existing courses	13
d.	Participation as a supervisors of student teachers	8
e.	Instructorship in an English methods course	6
f.	Service as a director of subsequent institutes	6
g.	Service as an instructor in subsequent institutes	8
h.	Authoship of college or secondary level textbooks	1
i.	Planning programs for in-service education	6
j.	Preparation of audio-visual aids	1
k.	Preparation of demonstration classes	1
l.	Service through speeches and articles	6
m.	Participation in revision of college curriculum	10
n.	Basic research	2
o.	Applied research	3

p. Basis for promotions (rank and/or salary) 2
q. Basis for joining another faculty 0
r. Other (specify) 0

The following recommendations, gleaned from questionnaire responses, interviews with participants and staff members, and impressions from the visit, are in part an endorsement of procedures followed in this institute:

1. Detailed advance planning is essential.
2. Course arrangements should be flexible enough to provide for participants with widely disparate backgrounds.
3. Provision for interaction among participants is desirable.
4. Staff members should meet together frequently. Parts of the program should be coordinated as much as possible.
5. A three-part program is good: it provides variety, offers the possibility of coordination, and yet does not confuse participants by a huge array of objectives. The omission of literature may not be serious, since most English teachers are already best prepared in that subject.
6. Bringing in insights from other disciplines, e.g., psychology and anthropology, is valuable.
7. The examination of research and the study of many NCTE and EIMC materials are worth while. The work with research studies requires especially careful planning. The research component could be a link to bind together the other two components.
8. Introduction of new concepts in linguistics and rhetoric is especially useful.
9. Thorough first-day orientation is useful.
10. Application as well as theory should be considered.
11. Work in small groups is helpful in some phases of the study, e.g., linguistics.
12. Seminars should be structured to some degree, but should not be dominated by staff members.
13. Work in the psychology of learning is admirably adapted to such an institute.
14. Specific research projects, perhaps undertaken by small groups, are worth while.
15. The importance of discussion sessions should not be minimized.
16. Attention to social activities is important. "Participants are people as well as minds."
17. The same readings need not be required of everyone.

18. The use of films and other A-V aids should be considered.
19. Housing arrangements, with participants preferably near one another, are important.

6. University of Minnesota--Foreign languages. Participants in this institute reacted as follows to these questions: (n = 28.)

FLM-1. This institute was designed to cover the eleven (11) areas listed below. Please rank the following areas by placing the number one (1) beside the area you are finding most valuable, the number two (2) after the next most valuable, etc. You may place several number one's if you think that there is more than one area that you consider very worthwile.

a.	The study of your major language	3.7
b.	The study of a new (second or third) foreign language	2.8
c.	The psychological basis for language learning	1.7
d.	The conducting and interpretation of research in foreign language learning	2.5
e.	The teaching of foreign languages at the advanced levels	2.6
f.	The development of methods and techniques	1.8
g.	The study of evaluation and testing	3.0
h.	Drill and laboratory procedures	4.2
i.	The preparation of student teachers	1.7
j.	The study of programed learning materials	4.7
k.	The study of FLES materials and programs	5.0
l.	Other (please identify)	

FLM-2. Concerning developing an understanding of current developments in foreign language pedagogy, the institute proposed to study: a) curriculum construction; b) methods, techniques and materials at the various language levels; c) testing; d) the incorporation of applied linguistics in the language class; e) the conduct and interpretation of research. Are all these being covered in a fashion you consider adequate, given your own background?

Adequately 17 Skimpily 2 Unevenly 9

FLM-3. According to the institute plan, it proposes to acquaint participants with significant scholarship, theories, and materials from disciplines which are having an impact on the learning of modern languages (psycholinguistics, human learning and verbal behavior, anthropology, the communications field, transformational grammar) and the implications of these for the foreign language teacher in developing a good learning program for the student. Are these being covered in a fashion you consider adequate, given your own background?

Adequately 21
Skimpily 2
Unevenly 5

FLM-4. The institute plans to acquaint participants with recent international studies in the psychology of language behavior and second language learning with special emphasis on their adaptation to the undergraduate program for the prospective modern language teachers. Are these being covered in a fashion you consider adequate, given your own background?

Adequately 17
Skimpily 8
Unevenly 3

FLM-5. The institute proposes to assist participants in developing a sense of the structure of a language discipline to enable them to choose more effectively from a variety of methods, practices such as team teaching, and materials now available and adapting such for use in the training and supervision of teachers. Are these being covered in a fashion you consider adequate, given your own background?

Adequately 18
Skimpily 3
Unevenly 7

FLM-6. The plan of the institute proposes acquainting participants with current attempts to structure a carefully articulated, sequential curriculum in a modern language, drawing from the fundamental concepts in the study of applied linguistics and human learning. Are all these being covered in a fashion you consider adequate, given your own background?

Adequately 17
Skimpily 3
Unevenly 8

FLM-7. The institute plan proposes to acquaint participants with a variety of new materials, technological advances, and procedures available for classroom use in the teaching of German, Spanish, and French. Please check the items below that represent your reactions:

a. Most of the materials are not new to me. 15
b. At least half of the materials are new to me. 12
c. The materials seem well selected. 19

d. The materials are often not well selected.	3
e. Many of the materials are books and other printed matter.	17
f. Many of the materials are audio-visual programs.	18

FLM-8. The plan proposes the development of instruments and scales for evaluating a) types of materials, and b) a foreign language curriculum in a fashion you consider adequate, given your own background?

Adequately	13
Skimpily	8
Unevenly	7

FLM-9. According to the plan, the institute proposes to acquaint participants with the new technological advances in laboratories and in the field of communications which will create an impact on future foreign language learning and teaching. Are all these being covered in a fashion you consider adequate, given your own background?

Adequately	22
Skimpily	5
Unevenly	1

FLM-10. The institute plan includes the teaching of a new (second, third) foreign language to each participant, using the fundamental skills approach. Do you think that this is a worthwhile part of the Institute?

Adequately	12
Skimpily	9
Unevenly	6

FLM-11. How would you rate the study in your major language?

Very profitable	12
Fairly profitable	9
Wasteful of time	6

FLM-12. The plan includes an attempt to show the participants ways and means of helping the prospective teacher teach modern literary selections and units in other disciplines (history, culture, economics, ect.) through the medium of the foreign language. Was this covered in a fashion you consider adequate?

Adequately	15
Skimpily	6
Unevenly	7

FLM-13. The institute includes a demonstration and discussion of learning different types of audio-visual machines such as the Fairchild Mark IV, overhead projector, laboratories, etc. Do you think, in general, that these sessions are profitable?

Very profitable	7
Fairly profitable	18
Wasteful of time	3

FLM-14. In Curriculum, Methods, Supervision Workshop the following areas are to be covered: the American educational system and the role of foreign languages, curriculum development, supervision practices, methods and techniques in the elementary and secondary curriculum, individual differences in the classroom, etc. Are all these being covered in a fashion you consider adequate, given your own background?

Adequately	22
Skimpily	3
Unevenly	3

FLM-15. The institute plan includes opportunity for an integration of all aspects of the Institute program by means of a Friday morning seminar. Do you think that this is:

Very profitable	13
Fairly profitable	13
Wasteful of time	2

FLM-18. Concerning the "special lecture and film series," please check the item below that most nearly represents your reacion:

a.	The lectures and films presented a wealth of new information and ideas.	a. 11
b.	They are occasionally useful.	b. 14
c.	They have little value.	c. 1

FLM-21. In your home institution, how available will most of the useful, relatively new books, materials and equipment be, should you and your colleagues wish to use them?

a.	We have most of them already and can get whatever else I want.	a. 1
b.	We have some of them and can get most others that I shall want.	b. 10
c.	We have a few of them but can get most that I want.	c. 4
d.	Our funds will be insufficient to obtain more than half of what I want.	d. 6
e.	Our funds will be insufficient to obtain more than a small portion of what I want.	e. 7

FLM-22. In connection with your work in improving your major language, or in learning another foreign language, were you able to use a language laboratory?

Yes 27
No 1

FLM-23. In connection with your work in instructional media, were the lectures theoretical or practical?

theoretical 3
practical 24

FLM-24. Did you have an opportunity to work in an instructional media laboratory and prepare overhead transparencies, dry mount, etc.?

Yes 25
No 1

FLM-26. Is there enough opportunity to practice the new foreign language and the major language being learned?

Yes 6
No 20

The following recommendations, gleaned from questionnaire responses, interviews with participants and staff, and impressions from the visit, are in part an endorsement of procedures followed *in this institute:*

1. Emphasis on current developments in teaching is considered highly desirable by participants.
2. Emphasis on underlying theories and recent scholarship is of much value.
3. Study of the psychology of language behavior and second language learning is useful.
4. Insights into the structure of a language may be deepened by an institute.
5. Principles of curriculum development are important for participants to learn.
6. Selection of appropriate materials is an important responsibility of director and staff.
7. Principles of evaluation (materials and curriculum) are important to teach.
8. Knowledge of recent technological advances should be imparted.
9. It is desirable that staff be openminded with regard to the conflicting and controversial theories of language teaching and language learning now current; they should not adhere to a rigid "party line."
10. Helps in teaching the reading of FL material in academic subjects are useful.
11. The experiment of holding a Friday morning seminar for purposes of integrating the week's work proved largely successful.
12. Adequate language laboratory facilities are essential.

13. Despite favorable reactions to the multiple list of announced objectives, director and staff believe that the objectives should be simplified and reduced. Participants are inclined to agree.
14. A schedule should not be impossibly heavy even for eager participants. The "shock language" might well be dropped. Too long a work day should be avoided.
15. Time should be allowed for reading, conferences, and interaction of participants.
16. Such institutes seem best adapted to participants with no previous NDEA experience. (Some disagreement.)
17. Interchange of participants' materials is desirable.
18. "Guidelines and strategies should be definite, but tactics flexible."
19. For such a group, emphasis on theory may well outweigh that on practice (though some participants vigorously disagree).
20. Staff members need awareness of problems in secondary teaching.
21. The possibility of more specialized institutes should be considered. Perhaps participants could be grouped by levels of linguistic sophistication rather than by the language they teach.
22. Housing should be as convenient as possible.
23. In discussion groups, the idea of having one person take notes, to be duplicated for all, works well.
24. Participants appreciate careful coordination of the work of the staff.
25. Live demonstration classes are useful.

7. University of Minnesota--Geography. Participants in this institute reacted as follows to these questions: (n = 20.)

GM-1. The institute was undertaken with several objectives in mind. From your point of view, what aspects of the summer program have been most useful? Enter the numerals (1, 2, 3, etc.) on each line to show the order of importance of the various objectives for your professional growth.

a.	Gains in subject matter content	2.9
b.	Insights on methods of analysis in geography	2.6
c.	The grasping of basic concepts in geography	3.0
d.	Introduction to new source materials	3.4
e.	Research methodology	5.0
f.	Gains in the use of instructional aids	6.2

g. A greater sense of the conceptual importance of geography among the sciences 4.6
h. Gains in modes of classroom, laboratory, and field presentation 4.3
i. Other (specify)______________________________

GM-2. The institute program involves several types of instructional activities. In each of the three objectives you selected as best in Question 1, which of the following instructional activities did you find most effective? Please rate effectiveness of these instructional activities by using the scale 1-4, with 1 being the most effective, 2 very effective, 3 moderately effective, and 4 least effective.

Objective 1 from Question 1____

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Class seminars	1	1	1	1	1		1	2
Field seminars	2	3	2	2	4		2	1
Small group instruction	3	2	3	4	3		3	
Individualized instruction	4	3	4	2	2		4	

Objective 2 from Question 1_____

Class seminars	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	2
Field seminars	3	2	3	3	4	3	3	2
Small group instruction	3	3	3	2	1	4	4	4
Individualized instruction	2	4	2	3	2	2		3

Objective 3 from Question 1_____

Class seminars	1		1	1	1		1	2
Field seminars	3		3	2	2		2	2
Small group instruction	3		3	3	4		4	2
Individualized instruction	3		4	4	2		3	3

GM-3. Each of the class seminars focused on a major theme. Please rate the seminars individually as to their usefulness in enhancing your effectiveness as a teacher of geography. Encircle appropriate numbers.

	Very useful		Moderately useful		Not useful
Regional Approach	1	2	[✓ 3]	4	5
Topical Approach	1	[✓ 2]	3	4	5
Environmental Perception	1	2	[✓ 3]	4	5
Culture Contact/Changes	1	2	[✓ 3]	4	5
Population	1	2	[✓ 3]	4	5
Climate/Vegetation Regions	1	2	[✓ 3]	4	5
Location Theory/Industrialization	1	[✓ 2]	3	4	5
Agricultural Systems	1	2	[✓ 3]	4	5
Transportation/Trade-Circulation	1	[✓ 2]	3	4	5
Mathematical/Astronomical Geography	1	2	[✓ 3]	4	5

Projection/Scale/Survey	[✓ 1]	2	3	4	5
Water/Heat Balance	1	2	[✓ 3]	4	5
Energy	1	[✓ 2]	3	4	5

GM-6. Each of the field seminars focused on a major theme. Please rate the field seminars individually as to their usefulness in enhancing your effectiveness as a teacher of geography. Encircle appropriate number.

	Very useful		Moderately useful		Not useful
Landform/Erosion	1	2	[✓ 3]	4	5
Rural Settlement	1	2	[✓ 3]	4	5
Urban System	1	[✓ 2]	3	4	5
Topoclimatology/Soils	1	2	[✓ 3]	4	5
Historical Geography	1	[✓ 2]	3	4	5

GM-9. A major emphasis during the course of the institute is placed upon the presentation of basic concepts in the discipline. Please check items below that represent your reactions to this feature of the program.

a.	Most of the concepts are not new to me.	2
b.	At least part of the concepts were new to me.	17
c.	The development of the concepts was well done.	9
d.	The concepts were not well developed often.	7
e.	The time spent on concepts should have been spent on other matters.	2
f.	The attention to concepts was worthwhile, in general.	13
g.	I expect to use a substantial portion of the approaches to conceptual development in my courses.	10
h.	I probably shall use a few of the approaches to conceptual development in my courses.	10

GM-11. To what degree were the seminar themes integrated with each other by the instructional staff? Encircle appropriate answer.

Considerably		Moderately		Hardly at all
1	2	[✓ 3]	4	5

GM-12. To what degree were the seminar themes integrated with the field seminar themes? Please encircle appropriate answer.

Considerably		Moderately		Hardly at all
1	2	[✓ 3]	4	5

GM-13. To what degree were the field seminar themes integrated with each other by the instructional staff? Please encircle appropriate answer.

Considerably		Moderately		Hardly at all
1	[✓ 2]	3	4	5

GM-16. Has participation in this institute altered you in any of the following ways? (Check those appropriate.)

a.	New intellectual interests	12
b.	Revised conceptions of teaching	8
c.	Altered plans for continuing education	1
d.	Stimulated interest in professional activities	8
e.	Stimulated interest in research	11
f.	Experienced changes in attitude toward primary and secondary teaching	5
g.	Widened perspectives on the nature of geography	15
h.	Increased awareness of the position of geography among the sciences	8

GM-17. How do you anticipate using what you have learned this summer? (Check as many items as are appropriate.)

a.	Modification of courses you currently offer	18
b.	Introduction of new course offerings	5
c.	Incorporation of new units of study in existing courses	14
d.	Participation as a supervisor of student teachers	3
e.	Greater involvement in social studies methods course	3
f.	Service as director of future institute	2
g.	Authorship of college or school textbooks	2
h.	Preparation of instructional aids	3
i.	Preparation of field course or classes	11
j.	Planning programs of in-service education	4
k.	Preparation of demonstration classes	1
l.	Service as resource person for speeches and articles	3
m.	Participation in college committee work for revising teacher preparation programs	6
n.	Extensive participation in research activities appropriate to improving instruction	4
o.	Consultantship with local school districts concerning offerings in geography	4
p.	Basis for advance in salary or rank, or both	4
q.	Basis for joining another faculty in the near future	2

The following recommendations, gleaned from questionnaire responses, interviews with participants and staff, and impressions from the visit, are in part an endorsement of procedures followed in this institute:

1. Field seminars need to be closely related to the rest of the program. They should not be overemphasized. They provide welcome breaks in routine, however.
2. Well-chosen lecturers have much to offer. At least some of them should be concerned with teaching elementary courses. Lectures followed by discussions are most approved.
3. Such an institute should be structured but not too tightly structured.
4. In selection of participants, an essay on applicant's intentions and a special questionnaire proved helpful.
5. Interaction of the group is desirable; so are opportunities for socializing.
6. Emphasis on concepts is of great value, as are study of methods of analysis in geography, instruction in new content, and introduction of new source materials.
7. Class seminars are by far the most generally approved instructional activities, followed by field seminars and small group instruction.
8. Faculty should permit considerable discussion. They should occasionally check to make sure they are not talking over the head of participants.
9. Make possible the interchange of copies of papers by participants.
10. Examples of actual lessons or exercises are desirable.
11. Staff should be sure that indiscussing some topics they are not "kicking a dead dog."
12. Participants find small group work profitable.
13. Some participants would welcome an emphasis on physical geography, though they also like the cultural emphasis.
14. Early mailings to selected participants help them to understand exactly what the program and their responsibilities will be.
15. Ample time for reading is desirable.

8. Tulane University--History. Participants in this institute responded as follows to these questions: (n = 29.)

HT-1. This institute is designed to cover the two objectives listed below. Please place a check after the area that you are finding more valuable.

a. To strengthen subject matter competence in modern European History	10
b. To provide acquaintance with new approaches and new materials in the teaching of history	19

HT-2. The institute's plan of operation lists four (4) major components in the pursuit of the above objectives. Please indicate in numberical order that element which has been most valuable in contributing to Objective a, a 2 after the next most valuable, and so on until you use a 4 to indicate the least valuable. Use the same ranking to evaluate the components as contributing to Objective b.

	a	b
a. Literature seminar	1	2
b. Group lectures	2	1
c. Group discussion and topical seminar	4	3
d. Guest lecturers	3	4

HT-3. As an element in its total program this institute provides visits to European History courses being regularly taught in the Tulane summer session. Please check items below that represent your reactions.

a. The techniques being utilized are not new to me.	25
b. The teaching techniques demonstrated are somewhat new to me.	1
c. The teaching techniques demonstrated are totally new to me.	0
d. The discussions with the course instructor proved fruitful.	23
e. The discussions with the instructor were not beneficial.	2
f. This visitation program served to reinforce the intent of the institute.	18
g. These classroom visits tended to negate the objectives of the institute.	2

HT-4. It is the stated intention of this institute to accommodate individual differences, and a major segment of the time is devoted to this purpose. How successful has this individualized instruction been in your own case?

a. Extremely helpful	9
b. Helpful	14
c. Wasteful of my time	3

HT-5. A major emphasis during the course of the institute is placed upon new materials. Please check the items below that represent your reactions to this feature of the program.

a.	Most of the materials are not new to me.	6
b.	At least part of the materials are new to me.	17
c.	The materials seem well selected for this purpose.	16
d.	The materials are not often well selected.	0
e.	The emphasis has been placed too exclusively upon books and other printed matter.	6
f.	Some of these materials emanate from the Project Social Studies Centers.	2
g.	A considerable portion of the materials are audio-visuals.	2
h.	In general, this focus has been worthwhile.	14
i.	In general, the time spent on this focus should be devoted to other concerns.	0
j.	I expect to use a major portion of these materials in my own teaching.	18
k.	I shall probably use few of these new materials in my own courses.	3

HT-7. In your home institution, how available will most of the useful new books, materials, and equipment be should you and your colleagues wish to use them?

a.	We have most of these already and can purchase whatever else seems appropriate	4
b.	We have some of them and can get most of the others which seem necessary.	11
c.	We have few of the items demonstrated but anticipate being able to get those needed.	8
d.	Institutional funds will be insufficient to obtain any major portion of desired materials.	3
e.	Our funds will be insufficient to obtain more than a very small portion of the materials desired.	2
f.	Our institution will not look with favor upon the expenditure of funds for this purpose.	0

HT-8. An auxiliary aim of this institution is to up-grade the preparation of secondary school teachers. Are you in agreement with this supplementary aim? Yes 25 No 1

HT-9. Has participation in this institute altered you in any of the following ways? (Check those appropriate.)

a.	New intellectual interests.	17
b.	Revised conceptions of teaching	9
c.	Altered plans for continuing education	3
d.	Stimulated interest in professional activities	12
e.	Experienced changes in attitude towards secondary teaching	3
f.	Renewed enthusiasm for teaching	13
g.	Widened acquaintance with interpretations of history	23
h.	Increased awareness of the contributions of other social science disciplines	13

HT-10. How do you anticipate using what you have learned this summer? (Check as many items as are appropriate.)

a.	Modification of courses you currently offer	23
b.	Introduction of new course offerings	9
c.	Incorporation of new units of study in existing courses	16
d.	Participation as a supervisor of student teachers	6
e.	Instructorship in a social studies methods course	2
f.	Service as director of subsequent institutes	3
g.	Authorship of college or secondary level textbooks	0
h.	Preparation of audio-visual aids	1
i.	Planning programs of in-service education	1
j.	Conducting field trips	2
k.	Preparation of demonstration classes	2
l.	Service as resource person for speeches and articles	7
m.	Participation on college committees working to revise teacher preparation programs	15
n.	Extensive participation in research activities appropriate to improving instruction	8
o.	Consultantships with local school districts concerning social studies offerings	3
p.	Basis for promotion (rank and/or salary) within your institution	6
q.	Basis for joining another faculty in the near future	1
r.	Other (specify)	1

The following recommendations, gleaned from questionnaire responses, interviews with participants and staff, and impressions from the visit, are in part an endorsement of the procedures followed in this institute:

1. Some participants like the idea of having a reading list before the institute, to give themselves a head start.
2. An ample supply of readily available books is important.
3. Stress on methodology, as well as on content, is important.
4. Informal exchanges among participants are very helpful.
5. Emphasis on historical interpretation is useful.
6. Small seminars are excellent. Ample discussion time should be provided, but discussion should be guided.
7. Stress on evaluation of textbooks and source materials is helpful.
8. It is important that an institute like this have clear objectives.
9. Most participants prefer no geographical limits on participation.
10. Having a number of solid 2-hour sessions is physically exhausting.
11. Orientation toward doctoral work rather than toward methods, etc., is questionable.
12. Work on specific skills such as problem-solving or research techniques is rewarding.
13. Avoid overspecialized lectures.
14. A number of visits to demonstration classes is useful.
15. Demonstration of A-V aids can be helpful.
16. Carefully prepared bibliographies are much appreciated; so is increased acquaintance with the multiple resources available for study and teaching of specific segments of history.
17. New approaches to the teaching of history need emphasis.
18. Clarification of ways that new knowledge may be put to use is desirable.
19. Perhaps the possibility of institutes for college teachers who do not work primarily or consciously with future secondary teachers should be explored.

9. University of Wyoming--Reading. Participants in this institute responded as follows to these questions: (n = 32.)

RW-3. In terms of their value to you when you return to your school or classroom in the fall, please rate the following curricular experiences provided by this institute.

(E=excellent; VG=very good; G=good; F=fair; P=poor)

		E	VG	G	F	P
a.	Laboratory experiences in the teaching of reading	13	13	3		
b.	Laboratory experiences in the supervision of student teachers	12	15	3		
c.	Seminars and conferences in connection with laboratory experiences in the teaching of reading	14	11	6	1	
d.	Seminars and conferences in connection with laboratory experiences in the supervision of student teachers	8	15	6		2
e.	The course "Supervision of Student Teaching"	5	8	8	5	
f.	The unit "Individual Differences in the Teaching of Reading"	22	7	2		
g.	The unit "Word Identification Skills"	3	5	8	7	7
h.	The course "Educational Media for More Effective Teaching of Reading"	13	14	2		
i.	The unit on i/t/a	20	7	4	1	
j.	The unit on motivation for reading	9	14	6	2	
k.	The unit (in the form of a twenty-hour seminar) on the problems of the supervision of student teachers and the teaching of reading	10	11	6		
l.	The panels on emotional, physical, and social problems which affect pupils' learning to read	6	12	5		
m.	The audio-visual, or educational media, laboratory	23	6	3		
n.	Sessions for evaluating new educational media and for sharing evaluations made	14	12	5		
o.	Guest lectures	25	6			
p.	Excursions	23	6	3		

RW-4. Listed below are the stated objectives of this institute. By placing a check mark (✓) in one of the columns to the right, please indicate the degree to which, in your opinion, each objective has been achieved.

	Completely	For the most part	To some extent	Not at all
a. To improve the qualifications of the supervisors of student teachers of reading .	14	18		
b. To train teachers of reading to supervise student teachers.	11	15	1	
c. To help the enrollees develop the attitude that supervision of student teachers is a privilege and responsibility of classroom teachers.	21	9	2	
d. To help the enrollees gain knowledge and understanding in the teaching of reading in the fields of:				
(1) motivation for reading	13	14	3	
(2) programed reading	16	16	1	
(3) individualized reading	19	10	1	
(4) speed reading	10	13	5	2
(5) media new to the teacher	19	12	1	
(6) i/t/a	25	6	1	
(7) the use of educational media in the teaching of reading	17	14		
(8) remedial reading in the regular classroom	10	16	6	
(9) enrichment in reading in the regular classroom	15	12	4	
(10) emotional, physical and social problems as they affect a pupil's learning to read	13	16	2	
e. To give the enrollee laboratory experiences in the supervision of student teachers who are teaching reading	22	8	1	
f. To help provide more teachers who are willing to accept student teachers in their classrooms	24	7	1	
g. To give the teacher a repertory of new ideas for the teaching of reading along with the attitude that if one method does not succeed with a child or group of children that the teacher may try another method of teaching reading	27	5		

RW-5. By placing a check mark ( ) in one of the columns to the right, please indicate your opinion as to the amount of time given to each curricular experience provided by this institute.

Curricular Experiences	Too Much	Just Right	Not quite enough	Not nearly enough
a. Laboratory experiences in the teaching of reading		25	6	
b. Laboratory experiences in the supervision of student teachers	2	17	10	
c. Seminars and conferences in connection with laboratory experiences in the teaching of reading	1	26	3	[illegible]
d. Seminars and conferences in connection with laboratory experiences in the supervision of student teachers		23	5	[illegible]
e. The course "Supervision of Student Teaching"	2	18	2	[illegible]
f. The unit "Individual Differences in the Teaching of Reading"		23	6	
g. The unit "Word Identification Skills"	10	12	5	[illegible]
h. The course "Educational Media for More Effective Teaching of Reading"		22	5	[illegible]
i. The unit on i/t/a	7	22	2	
j. The unit on motivation for reading		22	7	
k. The unit (in the form of a twenty-hour seminar) on the problems of the supervision of student teachers and the teaching of reading	1	22	3	
l. The panels on emotional, physical, and social problems which affect pupils; learning to read	1	19	4	
m. The audio-visual, or educational media, laboratory		26	5	
n. Sessions for evaluating new educational media and for sharing evaluations made		20	10	
o. Guest lectures	1	23	4	2
p. Excursions	4	26		

RW-10. In the planning and organizing of this institute, the Director and staff made every provision possible to assure that the individual needs and differences of participants would be met. In practice, what degree of success have they achieved?

Excellent 23; Very good 6 ; Good 2 ; Fair 1; Poor 0

RW-11. In relation to 9, have you had opportunity to concentrate attention and energy to a particular weakness in your teaching of reading?

Yes 27
No 4

RW-13. Did you take advantage of the opportunity offered you to use i/t/a materials in your teaching in the laboratory school?

Yes 3
No 27

RW-17. Specifically how do you anticipate using what you are learning this summer. (Check those appropriate.)

a.	Modification of courses you currently offer	24
b.	Introduction of new course offerings	16
c.	Incorporation of new units into existing courses of study	26
d.	Participation as a supervisor of student teachers	28
e.	Authorship of textbooks	2
f.	Preparation of audio-visual aids	25
g.	Planning programs of in-service education	25
h.	Conducting field trips	12
i.	Preparation of demonstration classes	16
j.	Material for speeches or articles	22
k.	Revision of college teacher-preparation programs	1
l.	Basic research	7
m.	Applied research	9
n.	Consultantships with local school systems	10
o.	Basis for promotion (rank and/or salary) within your institution	6
p.	Basis for joining another faculty in the near future	4

The following recommendations for future institutes, gleaned from the questionnaires, interviews with participants and staff members, and the visitor's impressions, are in part an endorsement of procedures followed in this institute:

1. A laboratory experience involving participants in small groups, combining practice with new methods and materials in teaching reading with teacher-training and supervision, is especially productive.
2. Reading supervisors respond favorably to practical work based upon theory currently believed sound.
3. Some of the social activities may be regarded as extensions of the class activities.
4. Participants at such an institute apparently delight in sharing bibliographies, kits, teaching aids, etc.

5. Treatment of such teachers as fellow-professionals rather than as students makes them work harder.
6. A rich and varied program is desirable.
7. Adequate materials, equipment, and facilities are essential.
8. Varied backgrounds of participants lead to useful exchanges of information and experiences.
9. The tendency of some participants to be mainly concerned with specific grade levels needs to be counteracted. Opportunity to visit classes on various grade levels is desirable.
10. Small group activity, allowing many contributions from participants, is desirable.
11. The quality of the director can make or break an institute.
12. The response to i/t/a among these participants was less than enthusiastic.
13. Guest lecturers, especially those with practical concerns, are well received.
14. Exposure to some radically new ideas is welcome.
15. Emphasis on understanding, not just acquisition of facts, is commendable.
16. Adequate time for library work is desirable.
17. Teamwork by staff is appreciated.
18. The inclusion of a few administrators is valuable both to them and to the other participants.

APPENDIX

This appendix consists of the list of nine 1966 NDEA Institutes for Trainers of Teachers. The list is quoted from the official NDEA brochure on all the institutes.

1. University of Arizona, Tucson. Special--Trainers of Teachers [in educational media]. 50 college teachers - June 20-August 12. Raymond L. Klein.

2. Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh. Special history institute for 24 college "methods" teachers and secondary school critic teachers. (Pennsylvania and open). June 20-July 29. Richard B. Ford.

3. Columbia University, Teachers College, New York. Special institute in applied linguistics for trainers of teachers of the hearing-impaired. 25 instructors from teacher preparation centers for the deaf, or members of State departments of education who are responsible for language instruction and in-service training. August 15-September 2. Ann M. Mulholland. (E-2; S-1)

4. University of California, Los Angeles. Materials preparation [in English as a foreign language]. 30 teachers and trainers of teachers (grades 1-12). June 20-August 13. J. Donald Bowen. (2)

5. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. Special institute for trainers of secondary school teachers of English. Language, Phetoric, and Conducting and Interpreting Research. 30 trainers of English teachers. June 20-August 5. Stanley B. Kegler.
(Master's degree and above)

6. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. 30 college and university trainers of teachers of French, German, and Spanish. June 20-August 5. Emma Birkmaier and Dale Lange.
(Master's degree and above)

7. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. Special (General Geography). 25 trainers of teachers. June 20-August 5. Fred E. Lukermann. (1)

8. Tulane University, New Orleans. Modern European History. 30 trainers of teachers. (South). June 13-August 5. Francis G. James. (1)

9. University of Wyoming, Laramie. 32 supervisors of student teachers of reading (grades 1-8); Wyoming and Rocky Mountain States). June 6-July 29. Roberta Starkey. (2)

SUMMARY

This document is a report on an assessment of nine NDEA-sponsored institutes for trainers of teachers, offered at seven universities in the summer of 1966. The purposes of the assessment were first, to discover whether such institutes, largely intended for college-level participants, possess sufficient merit to warrant the sponsoring of similar institutes in the future, and, second, if the answer to the first question is affirmative, to discover ways in which later institutes of this type may be strengthened.

Through questionnaires and interviews the persons responsible for the assessment found that the answer to the first question is a resounding "Yes": such institutes are indeed extremely valuable to the profession, and should if possible be increased in number in future years. With regard to the second question, it was found that there are a number of ways in which similar institute programs may be strengthened in future years. The recommendations deal with administrative details, teaching procedures, and content.